



BX 5035 .H43 1900

Church problems

CHURCH PROBLEMS

A VIEW OF
MODERN ANGLICANISM

✓
CHURCH PROBLEMS

A VIEW OF MODERN
ANGLICANISM

BY VARIOUS AUTHORS

EDITED BY ✓

H. HENSLEY HENSON

FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET

1900

PREFACE

ONE result of the unhappy controversies which have recently distracted the Church of England may be salutary. Many persons have been led to inquire into the history, obligations, working, and prospects of that historic society, which is not only a living branch of the "one, holy, Catholic Church," but also the oldest, most famous, and most widely beneficent of the National Institutions. There is some danger that the strife of ecclesiastical partisans shall delude and disgust them. The Church is greater than the conduct of some Churchmen suggests. The wider interests of her life are not concerned with the strivings of eager partisans.

This volume owes its origin to a deep desire to bring under the public view a worthier version of Anglicanism than that which is provided by the controversies of the hour. In asking my friends to combine with me in this undertaking, I suggested that it might be serviceable to recall the attention of Churchmen from the comparatively trivial issues of current conflict to the broader aspects of the question in debate; that it might be worth while to show how large an area of human life is affected by the fortunes of the Church of England and in what vital particulars; that it could not be other than calamitous that general interest should be concentrated on matters which, however exciting, are, on any broad view of the subject, scarcely vital. I proposed that we should attempt to set forward a view of the Church of England as a

working institution, together with a frank statement of the actual problems that encounter her in the way of her duty ; that we should do this from the standpoint of loyal Anglicans, men who believe with entire conviction in the worth and vigour of Anglicanism, who, while fully conscious of the difficulties which now gather about an established Church, desire to preserve the historic position of the Church of England, as the Church of the English people, recognised to be such by the law and constitution of the Realm, and holding by that title the ancient religious endowments of the nation. I stipulated for no further agreement, and I desired no more. This expresses and exhausts the measure of our common responsibility. Every writer is answerable for his own contribution and for nothing more. The Editor is responsible for the plan of the volume, and the choice of subjects and authors.

I regret that the pressure of his public duty has hindered Lord Selborne from writing the article which in the first announcement of this volume was assigned to him. His Lordship's loyalty to the English Church is so well known and proved that special value would have attached to his co-operation. I have to thank my friend Mr. Whitmore for undertaking the article on "Disendowment" instead of Lord Selborne.

Also I have to thank my friend and neighbour the Rev. S. Kirshbaum, M.A., of Barking, for finding time, in the midst of arduous parochial work, to prepare an index, which will, I think, be found convenient to readers.

H. HENSLEY HENSON.

ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL,
ILFORD, *February*, 1900.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	1
<i>By H. HENSLEY HENSON, B.D., Fellow of All Souls, Oxford.</i>	
II. ESTABLISHMENT	32
<i>By H. HENSLEY HENSON, B.D.</i>	
III. DISENDOWMENT	79
<i>By C. A. WHITMORE, M.P.</i>	
IV. THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM	113
<i>By EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, D.D., Vicar of Leeds.</i>	
V. CONVOCATION	142
<i>By W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.</i>	
VI. ANGLICAN THEOLOGY	164
<i>By W. O. BURROWS, M.A., late Principal of Leeds Clergy School.</i>	
VII. ANGLICAN WORSHIP	180
<i>By W. O. BURROWS, M.A.</i>	
VIII. RELATIONS WITH EASTERN CHURCHES	210
<i>By A. C. HEADLAM, B.D., Rector of Welwyn.</i>	
IX. THE CHURCH AND NONCONFORMITY	254
<i>By E. W. WATSON, M.A., Warden of St. Andrew's Missioners.</i>	
X. EDUCATION	274
<i>By H. A. DALTON, M.A., Head Master of Felsted School.</i>	

	PAGE
XI. THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM. . .	310
<i>By T. B. STRONG, B.D., Student of Christ Church.</i>	
XII. THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRE . . .	348
<i>By BERNARD WILSON, M.A., Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green.</i>	
XIII. THE ANGLICAN SPIRIT IN LITERATURE . .	394
<i>By H. C. BEECHING, M.A., Rector of Yattendon.</i>	
XIV. THE ROMAN CONTROVERSY . . .	432
<i>By W. E. COLLINS, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College.</i>	
XV. UNIFORMITY	454
<i>By W. E. COLLINS, M.A.</i>	
XVI. PARTIES IN THE CHURCH	487
<i>By LORD HUGH CECIL, M.P.</i>	
INDEX	523

CHURCH PROBLEMS

I.

The Church of England

BY THE REV. H. HENSLEY HENSON

THE Church of England is the most perplexing of institutions. It provokes the most various sentiments, and lends itself easily to the most contradictory descriptions. Foreigners find it very unintelligible, and, it must be confessed, very uninviting, but their hardest sayings could be paralleled from the pages of domestic critics. Ignatius von Döllinger, in days when he was still reckoned a pillar of the Roman Communion, has described the Church of England in language of fervid scorn, which may be taken to represent the attitude of many cultivated foreigners:—

“There is no Church that is so completely and thoroughly as the Anglican the product and expression of the wants and wishes, the modes of thought and cast of character, not of a certain nationality, but of a fragment of a nation, namely, the rich, fashionable, and cultivated classes. It is the religion of deportment, of gentility, of clerical reserve. Religion and the Church are then required to be, above all things, not troublesome, not intrusive, not presuming, not importunate. . . . Its insulated character, also, its separation from every other Christian community suits the national taste, and is a popular feature of the Anglican Church. The Englishman, especially

of the higher ranks, finds it quite in the proper order of things that he should have a Church exclusively to himself, in which no other nation has any share; a Church, too, which, while it has all the accommodating spirit, the reserve, and the exclusiveness of Continental Protestantism, on the other hand assumes, by means of its Episcopacy and its more liturgical character, an aspect of more dignity and importance.” *

The accomplished author of these bitter sarcasms lived to understand the Church of England better, and nowhere else is his memory held in such veneration as in the communion which he had so grievously insulted. We reproduce his words here not merely as illustrating the opinion of cultivated foreigners, but as pointing out, though with unfair emphasis, characteristics of the Church of England which, however they may be mitigated and neutralised by other elements, do arrest notice and alienate support. A more discriminating and better-informed view is that of the Rev. Mark Pattison, late Rector of Lincoln College, originally put forward in the year 1863:—

“Anglicanism is not, as is often repeated by ill-informed assailants, an artificial creation of Laud and the courtier-bishops of Charles I., but the legitimate and necessary form which the Church intelligence of England took, as soon as it had time to repose from the turbulence and volcanic upheaving of the religious revolution. Thus it is that Anglicanism has always been the religion of the educated classes exclusively. It has never at any period been national and popular, because it implies more historical information and a wider political horizon than can be possessed by the peasant or the artisan. The masses require an intuitional religion, such as is provided by the grosser forms of Dissent in Great Britain, or a ceremonial of drill and parade, such as the Latin and Greek Churches offer to their subject populations.” †

* *The Church and the Churches*, translated by W. B. McCABE, pp. 145-6. [London, 1862.]

† *Essays*, p. 267. [Oxford, 1889.]

This is a very fair representation of academic opinion on the subject of the National Church, and it has the defects of academic opinion. It is supercilious, confident, and partial. None the less, however, it expresses with force and effect so much of the facts as it takes account of. Mr. Brewer, approaching the subject from the side of history, took another view. To his thinking the Reformed Church was a dull, prosaic, useful institution, destitute equally of the romantic charm and the immense abuses of its mediæval predecessor.

"The Reformed Church of England has always found its strongest hold in the middle classes of this country."

Accordingly the explanation of the distinctive features of the English Church must be sought in the habits and ideals of the middle classes.

"The Englishman of the middle class estimates a Church, established or otherwise, by its utility: he measures its importance by its usefulness to his family, to his village, or to his parish, and lastly, perhaps least of all, to himself."*

Mr. Brewer's view was certainly true of the sixteenth century; in some sense it is true to say that this prosaic, utilitarian conception of the Church found expression in Hooker's immortal work, but another spirit revealed its presence in the Reformed Church as the seventeenth century advanced. The Anglo-Catholicism of Laud and his contemporaries was neither the creature of middle-class habits, nor the exposition of middle-class ideals. The Puritanism of Elizabeth's reign, which was specifically the middle-class element in the National Church, became increasingly restive within its pale, and finally, exchanging Nonconformity for Dissent, rose in revolt and levelled to the ground the whole ecclesiastical fabric. Certainly it is in the Dissenting denominations rather

* *Henry VIII.*, pp. 470-1.

than in the Established Church that the mind of the middle classes has found fullest expression, and the motive forces of Protestantism, which in the sixteenth century effected the breach with the mediæval tradition of faith and worship, have their most natural and unimpeded course outside the English Church. It was inevitable that in the first stages of the Reformation, when all the forces of change were barely adequate to overcome the conservative power of the existing system, the Reformers should have thought, spoken, and acted with an unbalanced and one-sided vehemence. Their avowed intentions, their personal beliefs, their precedents of ecclesiastical practice must be discounted by the conditions of their time. The essential principles of the English Reformation must be sought elsewhere. In what they destroyed the men of the sixteenth century were often the blind agents of contemporary passions. They wrecked the painted windows, and broke down the carved work of the sanctuary, and ground the "idols" to powder after the Mosaic precedent, and no reasonable man dreams of elevating their iconoclasm into a law of practice.* They poured out their indignation against superstitions, which were gross, and pontiffs, who were scandalous, in language of vehement and brutal scorn, which no just man would rehearse as honourable to their memories or illustrative of their piety. In what they preserved and revised the men of the sixteenth century acted deliberately, for the most part, against the prevailing tendencies of the time, often perhaps against their own preferences. Therefore the essential principles of Anglicanism stand out to view most conspicuously in the Book of Common Prayer.

* Cf. MARK PATTISON's dictum: "The only key to a revolutionary epoch is the results which actually establish themselves. Posterity which witnesses these, may by their aid interpret the quarrel out of which they arose."—*Essays*, vol. ii. p. 3.

The Homilies and even, though in a less degree, the Articles* have a temporary purpose, a transitory validity, a contingent worth. They are, by general consent, already relegated to the category of "historical memorials": but the Prayer-book, representing the purged and ordered current of traditional religion, exhibits the permanent effects of Reformation, and forms the true and abiding standard of Anglican orthodoxy. It embodies the Anglican version of the Catholic system. Anglican history confirms this account of Anglican principles. In times of national unrest, when passions are stirred and men regard with hostile eyes the institutions of society, the Church of England attracts to itself a disproportionate share of unpopularity. It is reviled as an impossible and dishonest compromise, answering clearly to no popular conviction, and serving apparently no popular interest. But in quiet times it is otherwise. The Prayer-book has its effect: a distinctive Churchmanship shows itself, and finds expression in art, literature, and theology. That distinctive Churchmanship is not Protestant,† but Catholic—if, without offence, we may employ a term so contentious and so inevitable. We submit that the distinctive colour of Nonconformist Christianity is Protestant, and the distinctive colour of Anglican Christianity is Catholic.

The successful assertion of their civil and political rights by the Dissenters has tended to de-Protestantise the Church of England, for, by no conscious effort either

* The Clerical Subscription Act of 1865, passed in consequence of an earnest movement for increased intellectual liberty within the Church, abolished the old, strict form of subscription, and substituted a vague and elastic "assent." And at no time have the 39 Articles bound the laity.

† We have stated below the reasons why we avoid applying this term to the Church of England. In its historic and controversial senses it is not applicable to that church. Broadly we may observe that Protestantism emphasises the individual, and Catholicism the society: thus in the latter the Divine-right Ministry and the Sacraments are of cardinal importance; in the former they are perhaps desirable, but certainly optional

within or without the Church, but solely by the normal working out of a natural law, the Protestant will bestow his spiritual allegiance where his principles have fullest exposition. Of course if Catholicism were rightly identified with the system of the Roman Church, then the consequence, which so many people seem to dread, would properly follow. The gradual elimination of the distinctive Protestant element from the National Church would advance *pari passu* with the gradual approximation of the National Church to the model of Rome. If, however, Catholicism be truly distinct from that modern system which arrogates to itself a monopoly of the Catholic name, if the notion of a *Via Media* be something more respectable than that of political compromise, if the National Church be something more legitimate than a theological half-way house where doubt is christened inquiry, and unbelief screened by evasion, then the de-Protestantising of the Church of England may be ministerial to the widest influence for good which that Church possesses. Coleridge, in his *Table Talk*, is related to have spoken with characteristic energy against the common use of the word "Catholic" as synonymous with "Roman":—

"The present adherents of the Church of Rome," he said, "are not, in my judgment, Catholics. We are the Catholics. We can prove that we hold the doctrines of the primitive Church for the first three hundred years. The Council of Trent made the Papists what they are.

"A person said to me lately, 'But you will, for civility's sake, call them *Catholics*, will you not?' I answered that I would not, for I would not tell a lie upon any, much less upon so solemn an occasion. The adherents of the Church of Rome, I repeat, are not *Catholic* Christians. If they are, then it follows that we Protestants are heretics and schismatics, as indeed, the Papists very logically, from their own premisses, call us. And '*Roman Catholics*' makes no difference. Catholicism is not capable of degrees or local apportionments. There can be but

one body of Catholics *ex vi termini*. To talk strictly of *Irish* or *Scotch* Roman Catholics is a mere absurdity." *

Of course the large-minded philosopher was not excluding Roman Catholics from the pale of salvation; he was only *more suo* urging a more careful use of religious terms. The English Church was properly Catholic because it had, in his judgment, loyally adhered to the Catholic tradition, without subtracting from or adding to it. We are not here concerned with the Roman Catholic *Apologia*; but it is vital to the argument of this essay, and, indeed, to the understanding of this volume of essays, to grasp the meaning which is attached to this word "Anglicanism," which appears so frequently in our pages, and figures on the title-page. If the term "Catholicism" had not been so depraved by controversial usage as to prohibit the hope that it could, in the general mind, be severed from its Roman associations, we should certainly have preferred it on many grounds, for nothing is farther from the thought of the writers of these essays than to suggest that the Christian revelation can in any measure be tampered with in deference to local and political conditions. "Anglicanism" does not essentially mean a revised Christianity—the creature of the English temperament, the product of the English soil—but rather the original and changeless Catholic faith and discipline, as both have filtered through the medium of a national history, and found practical expression in the organisation, traditions, and formularies of a National Church. Anglicanism is properly historic Christianity within the sphere of English influence. Its

* *Table Talk*, pp. 19, 20, 3rd edition. [London, 1851.] See the very sensible remarks on the question of ecclesiastical nomenclature by Provost Salmon in his admirable "Infallibility of the Church," Preface, p. viii. fol. "To speak honestly, of all the sects into which Christendom is divided, none appears to me less entitled to the name Catholic than the Roman."

essentials are Catholic; its accidents and incidents are local and ethnical. When the Church of England is described as "Protestant," the door is opened to a grave misunderstanding. It is certainly true that the great divines of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries were accustomed to describe themselves as Protestants. The Tractarians inaugurated the modern dislike of the name, but in justice it must be admitted, on the one hand, that the older Anglican divines, while using the name, and even in some cases admitting on specific grounds of equity the ordinations of non-episcopal Churches,* were careful to emphasise the distinctively Catholic character of their own Church; and, on the other hand, that the course of modern controversy has rendered the language which they used, and the liberty which they allowed, open to certain misconstructions, which then had no likelihood. Jeremy Taylor habitually refers to the Church of England as Protestant, herein, as we have said, following the general practice; but he seems to connect Protestantism specifically with monarchical sentiments and the maintenance of Episcopacy. The Papacy, to his thinking, was the natural foe of the monarch and the bishop. In his great sermon before the Irish Parliament in 1661 he seems to distinguish between "Presbyterians" and "Protestants," and he bases on the fact of their Protestantism a very earnest ex-

* v. THORNDIKE, *Works*, vol. i. part ii. p. 503 fol.; also vol. v. p. 297. BRAMHALL, *Works*, vol. iii. p. 475: "I dare not limit the extraordinary operation of God's Spirit, where ordinary means are wanting, without the default of the persons." Also p. 517 fol., where he quotes with approval the well-known opinion of Bishop Andrewes: "He is blind who doth not see Churches consisting without it (Episcopacy)." Cosin justified communicating with the Protestants in Paris to avoid scandal. In the sixteenth century there was hardly any question about the validity of ordinations and sacraments in the foreign reformed Churches: but the revolutionary character of that age scarcely admits of the notion that its practice can be accepted as illustrative of anything more than immediate exigency.

hortation to his hearers to active support of the restored Bishops.*

"For I beseech you to consider, *all you that are true Protestants*. Do you not think that your religion is holy and apostolical, and taught by Christ, and pleasing unto God? If you do not think so, why do you not leave it? but if you do think so, why are you not zealous for it? Is not the government a part of it? It is that which immures, and adorns, and conducts all the rest, and is established in the Thirty-sixth Article of the Church, in the public service-book, and in the book of consecration; it is therefore a part of our religion, and is not all of it worth preserving?" †

In the fine sermon, entitled *Via Intelligentiæ*, preached before "the little, but excellent University of Dublin," he says plainly that "perfect submission to kings is the glory of the Protestant cause." ‡ It is hardly too much to say that by "Protestant," apart from the notion of opposition to Romanism, Jeremy Taylor meant those very qualities of the National Church which are most offensive to the "good Protestant" of contemporary agitation. If we deprecate the use of the term, as descriptive of the Church of England, it is certainly with no design of derogating from the greatness of Protestantism, with no reflection on the older usage of English Churchmen, with no desire to claim for the Church of England any other character than that which is assumed in the Prayer-book. Our sole reason is the wish to secure lucidity, and so to escape the numerous confusions which have arisen from no other cause than lack of lucidity. The word "Protestant" is currently used in at least three distinct senses, and it is important to recognise how far, if at all, these senses can be asserted for the Church of England. Thus (i.) it will be

* JEREMY TAYLOR'S *Works*, ed. Heber, vol. vi. pp. 348-9. I have been assured by Irish friends that the term "Protestant" still stands in the common parlance of Ireland for a member of the Church of Ireland.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 361-2.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

universally admitted that in the *strict historical sense* of the word the Church of England is not Protestant. In that sense the term belongs exclusively to those reformed Churches which subscribe the "Confession of Augsburg," presented to Charles V., in 1530, by the German princes who had "protested" at the Diet of Spire in the preceding year against the Emperor's revocation of the tolerant Edict issued in 1526. Nor (ii.) will it be denied by any candid person that there is a further *controversial use* of the term, in which it is applied to those reformed denominations which reject the episcopal government and the doctrine of apostolic succession which that government assumes, and that in this sense also the Church of England cannot be called "Protestant."* There remains (iii.) nothing but the broad distinction of the Reformation itself. If "Protestant" be synonymous with "reformed," and carry no further suggestion, then the Church of England is Protestant. All the doctrine which is involved in the specific repudiation of the mediæval conception of Christendom is necessarily Anglican. Thus the proper opposite of "Protestant" is not "Catholic," but "Papist." In this restricted sense it is used in the Coronation Oath and in the Act of Settlement. Neither in the Prayer-book nor in the Articles does it appear. In face of these facts it ought not to carry any offensive suggestion if, in the interest of accuracy, the name is set aside in favour of the term "Anglican," which hardly admits of misconception to the same extent, or of the same degree of gravity.

* Dr. Martineau's acuteness led him to recognise frankly the non-Protestant character of the Church of England. "It is undeniable that the sacramental and priestly doctrine embodied in the Anglican movement is fully authorised by the formularies of the Church, and that no clergyman who disbelieves it can have given a veracious 'assent and consent,' 'willingly and ex animo,' 'to all things contained in them.'" The *raison d'être* of the Protestant, pure and simple, in the English Church is solely historical, and as such it is adequate.

Anglicanism, then, is a distinctive thing in Christendom, not distinctive in any fatal sense, but necessarily expressing thus the singular historic conditions under which the Church of England was reformed, and filling thus the rôle in Christendom, which neither the Protestant Churches nor the Papal Communion, for different reasons, can fill with the same hope of success. It is worth while to dwell on these aspects of Anglicanism.

1. The Reformation may be considered and described from many points of view, and it is hardly possible in a few sentences to indicate with any justice its range and gravity. As a political movement, it expressed the maturity of nationhood.

The united Christendom of the crusades had long vanished, and almost suddenly modern Europe discovered itself to view. The English Reformation reflected the comparatively advanced stage of the national development. Circumstances had favoured English independence; and the Statute-book already contained enactments which, in the hands of Henry VIII., could serve as the effectual instruments of ecclesiastical revolution. It was no mere fiction that in abolishing papal authority he was vindicating for his "imperial" crown its ancient prerogatives, but those prerogatives had in the past been exercised within the sphere of Christendom, under the conditions of Catholic sovereignty. When these terms and limits expired, the royal supremacy took an altogether novel and portentous character. Thus it is not true to infer from the anti-papal legislation of the Middle Ages that the Church of England enjoyed in those times an exceptional measure of independence. Nowhere was the papal claim to spiritual and ecclesiastical sovereignty more fully conceded than in England, and nowhere was it more rigorously enforced. "The evidence of an unquestioned acceptance of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope as

head of the Christian Church is simply overwhelming.* But not less overwhelming is the evidence of friction becoming ever more acute between the developing national self-consciousness and the Papacy. The Tudor sovereigns embodied the patriotic sentiment of the English people; and it was no difficult task to utilise in the ecclesiastical sphere the anti-Roman feeling which was traditional in the sphere of politics.† Anglicanism necessarily reflects the influence of that tide of national feeling which has given distinctive colour and character to our constitution, our literature, our social customs, our architecture; but this need not of itself have involved any breach with the theology of mediæval Christendom. The Reformation, however, was not solely or mainly political, though in the early stages of the English movement the political aspect was paramount. It was "an attempt to restore the equilibrium of science and religion, which had been disturbed by the gradual growth of human knowledge," in consequence of which "a monstrous antagonism had grown up between the conclusions of human reason and the decisions of the Church." In a recent volume Dom Gasquet labours to prove that the Renaissance found its natural ally and most ungrudging patron in the mediæval Church; but he only succeeds in showing what no one disputes—that many eminent ecclesiastics were themselves disciples of the new learning. It is noteworthy that Erasmus, on whom Dom Gasquet builds much, "takes a place of extraordinary prominence" in the first Papal Index.‡

* GASQUET, *The Eve of the Reformation*, p. 79.

† Cf. Dr. Gardiner's observation [*History*, vol. ix. p. 145]: "The divine right of kings had been a popular theory when it coincided with a suppressed assertion of the divine right of the nation."

‡ Official lists of prohibited books are, of course, much older; but in 1557, and again in 1559, Pope Paul IV., through the Inquisition at Rome, published what may be regarded as the first Roman Index in the modern ecclesiastical use of that term," v. *Enc. Brit.* vol. xii. p. 730. For the modern Index see *Urbs et Orbis*, by W. Humphrey, S.J., p. 415 fol.

"Not only was he placed in the first class" (*i.e.* authors who were heretics by intention (*ex professo*), and all of whose writings were condemned), "but a special clause was added to his name; 'with all his commentaries, notes, scholia, dialogues, letters, censures, translations, books, and writings even when they contain nothing against religion or about religion.'"*

This savage condemnation is more representative of the mind of the mediæval Church than the patronage of a Leo or a Warham. The Reformation was intellectually a parting of the ways, and Anglicanism reflects the choice then made by the Church of England.

"It had to choose between conforming its doctrine and discipline to the accumulated knowledge of the time, or of breaking for ever with the intellectual progress of Europe."†

And it chose the former. The English Reformation rested, it has been recently affirmed, on the basis of "sound learning." Always bearing in mind that the sphere of discussion in the sixteenth century was straitly limited, and that the means of discussion were from the modern standpoint extremely defective, this formula may be accepted. The rivals to "sound learning" were, on the one hand, the current ecclesiastical tradition; on the other, the letter of Scripture. At the Council of Trent the Roman Church accepted the first; partly under the pressure of their circumstances, still more, perhaps, under the excessive influence of masterful individuals, the Protestant Churches abroad, and the Puritans in England, accepted the last.‡ Of both, though in different measures,

* *Heroes of the Reformation*: "Erasmus," by Prof. EMERTON, pp. 454-5. This is a very masterly and well-informed sketch of the greatest figure of the Renaissance.

† M. PATTISON, *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 307.

‡ Cf. COLERIDGE, *Table Talk*, p. 93: "The Puritans pushed this bias (against human authority) to an absolute bibliolatry. They would not put on a corn-plaster without scraping a text over it. Men of learning, however, soon felt that this was wrong in the other extreme, and indeed united itself to the

it is not untrue to say that the effect has been the same—the tendency for sound learning to pass outside the ecclesiastical sphere. The Church of England neither stood by the current tradition nor unreservedly adopted the authority of Scripture. In the flood tide of change, the *via media* expressed less the mind of Anglican Churchmen than the idiosyncrasy of Henry VIII. and his daughter; but when the flood tide had ebbed, and in a calmer time men turned their thoughts to the task of religious reconstruction, the *via media* of sound learning was deliberately affirmed and defended. Hence the Church of England has, in a unique degree, attracted and retained the allegiance of thoughtful and learned men. A striking example is the case of Isaac Casaubon [1559–1614],* whose biography has been so admirably written by a kindred-minded student of our own time. The son of a Calvinist pastor, and brought up under the strictest influences of Calvinist orthodoxy, living for years in the society of the Calvinist leaders, Casaubon was led by his researches into antiquity to suspect, to criticise, and to repudiate his ancestral creed.

In 1610 he writes to Daniel Tilenus, theological professor at Sedan, a very interesting account of his mental history:

“I compared the writings of our friends and their opponents with the doctrine of the ancient Church. Among the rest I read Bellarmine. On Scripture, tradition, the authority of the old commentators, on the power of the Pope, on images, on indulgences, I could by certain reasons demonstrate all Bellarmine’s positions to be false. But when I come to the chapter on the Sacraments (though there be also some things which can

very abuse it seemed to shun. They saw that a knowledge of the Fathers and of early tradition was absolutely necessary.”

So also M. PATTISON notices that, “Greatly as the Calvinistic Churches have served the cause of political liberty, they have contributed nothing to the progress of knowledge” [*Essays*, vol. ii. p. 41].

* *Isaac Casaubon*, by MARK PATTISON. [London, 1875.]

be refuted), it is no less clear to me that the whole of antiquity with one consent is on the side of our opponents, and that our writers, who have attempted to show that the Fathers have held our views, have egregiously wasted their time. The careful study of the ancients has raised certain scruples in my mind. About these I would give a kingdom to consult you, for all I desire is to learn. That I am staggered by the consent of the whole ancient and orthodox Church I cannot conceal." *

To Casaubon, thus-minded, the Church of England wore an attractive aspect. He found there precisely the same grounds adopted as his solitary studies had justified to himself.†

"You must not suppose," he writes to Saumaise, "that this people is a barbarous people: nothing of the sort; it loves letters and cultivates them, sacred learning especially. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, *the soundest part of the whole Reformation is to be found here in England*, where the study of antiquity flourishes together with zeal for the truth." ‡

Without renouncing the membership of his own Church Casaubon received on his death-bed the Holy Communion from the hands of Bishop Andrewes, and he was buried in Westminster Abbey "on the west or historical side of the aisle, next the monument of Mr. Camden: both whose plain tombs, made of white marble, show the simplicity of their intentions, the candidness of their natures, and perpetuity of their memories." Fuller adds that the tomb "was erected at the cost of Thomas Morton, bishop of Durham, that great lover of learned men, dead or alive."§

* *Ibid.*, p. 254.

† "The Anglican ritual exactly met his aspirations after the decent simplicity of primitive worship."—*Ibid.*, p. 340.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 327-8.

§ FULLER, *Church History of Britain*, Book x., s. 35. Dean Stanley (*Memorials of Westminster Abbey*) says that Izaak Walton "scratched his well-known monogram on the marble, with the date 1658, earliest of those unhappy inscriptions of names of visitors, which have since defaced so many a sacred space in the Abbey," p. 307.

Casaubon was not alone in his opinion of the English Reformation. Bramhall affirms of the eminent Grotius [1583-1645] that "he was in affection a friend, and in desire a true son of the Church of England: and upon his death-bed recommended that Church as it was legally established to his wife, and such other of his family as were then about him, obliging them by his authority to adhere firmly to it, so far as they had opportunity."* It is possible, perhaps probable, that the Anglican prelate assumed too much when he credited Grotius with a definite desire to join the English Church, but there can be no doubt as to the direction of his sympathies. Sound learning, as the basis of a Church, manifestly involves a large measure of adaptability. As the intellectual horizon is enlarged, so the necessity of revision and restatement is continually coming upon the guardian of revealed truth. It is not open to the Church of England, without going back from its own principles, to refuse audience to new ideas, or to decline as evil in itself any proposition of change which does not compromise those original and fundamental verities, to attest and apply which is the *raison d'être* of the Christian Society. Unquestionably the essential liberality of Anglicanism has not been at all times apparent in the language and action of individuals and parties within the pale of the Church. Thus one Archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift) in 1595 would have imposed on the Church the disastrous burden of Calvinist dogma in the Lambeth Articles: and another (Laud) in 1640 would have tied us to the proposition that "the most high and sacred order of kings is of Divine Right." More recently the ardour of evangelistic zeal or the no less powerful passion for ecclesiastical tradition has again and again threatened with destruction the national system which bridles the one and shocks the

* *v. Works*, iii. p. 513. [Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.]

other: but Anglicanism has survived the changes and chances of history, and justifies itself increasingly to men of good-will. It would be affectation to deny that among the preservative influences to which this happy result is due an important, perhaps even a primary, place must be given to the fact of Establishment. The heavy hand of the State has intervened between ecclesiastical passion and its natural effects, and, in times of popular excitement, of crises in the Church when religious prejudices are at fever-heat, and the atmosphere is thick with the missiles of controversy, "sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England" have learned to regard with tolerance born of gratitude those bands of the law which in calmer times seem perhaps so humiliating and intolerable. If from all this unfriendly critics would draw an inference discreditable to our Church, as if it depended in excessive measure on the arm of flesh, it must suffice to answer that in this respect the Church of England but illustrates the common fortune of the Church Catholic. Christians who are accustomed to revere the dispositions of an overruling Providence in the circumstances which induced an ambitious and still heathen Constantine to assemble the Council of Nicæa, and thus to provide the distracted Church with her formula of faith, will not find anything incongruous in the fact that in later times and for lesser emergencies the English State should be ministerial to Christian truth. A wide view of Christian history as a whole will disallow the too hasty conclusions of a narrow and superficial study of our national experience. Whatever the causes the fact is evident. The Church of England remains to us still, and we can appraise on a review of three centuries and a half the measure in which it has justified the promise of its reformation. Even opponents allow that the relation between Christianity and the intellectual life of the time is in England more

natural and amicable than elsewhere. They explain the fact variously ; with some the secret lies in the mental stagnation of English society, its obstinate conservatism, its innate bondage to convention, its dislike of innovation ; with others the explanation is found in the essential emptiness of English religion.

“The patience of the English race, the endowments of the English Church, and the respectable character of the English clergy, only mask for a while the fact, conspicuous in the rest of Europe, that the orthodoxy of the sixteenth century has worn itself out, and gives no adequate voice to the faith and piety of the present age.”*

Fifty years have passed since Dr. Martineau wrote thus, and it is safe to say that his words were truer then than now ; yet, if his diagnosis of the situation had been sound, his words ought to have received luminous exposition and abundant proof in the interval. For the last half-century has witnessed an intellectual revolution, more rapid, far-reaching, and drastic than any since the Reformation. It has been a testing-time for the Churches. Yet, whatever else may be said against the National Church of England, it cannot be asserted that within its sphere of influence the authority of Christianity has conspicuously waned in English society. The place of the clergy in the intellectual life of the time has been distinguished and honourable ; the great traditions of the Caroline epoch have been maintained, and the “sound learning” of Anglicanism vindicated in many directions.

* *Essays, Reviews, and Addresses*, vol. ii. p. 68. The quotation is from an article entitled “The Church of England” in the *Westminster Review*, 1850. There was very much in the aspect of ecclesiastical politics at that time to justify the severity of language employed throughout this article. The venerable author would have been the first to recognise the salutary change which has passed over the nation in this respect, a change to which he himself in no small measure contributed.

It is true that there are causes for anxiety lest the twentieth century shall not, in this respect, altogether sustain the tradition of the nineteenth; but the history of Anglicanism teaches nothing more clearly than the futility of prophecy and the folly of despair. Archbishop Tait, in his Charge, delivered at his primary visitation in 1872, dwelt on this honourable mark of Anglicanism that beyond all other varieties of Christianity it reconciled itself to the new knowledge of the age.

“It is commonly said nowadays, in many countries, that Christianity and Reason must be divorced; that Christianity and Civilisation—modern civilisation—are antagonists to each other. Certainly we, in the Church of England, have no fear lest there should be any real antagonism between God’s two great lights to man—Reason and Science as its product on the one hand, and Revelation on the other.”

He went on to mention the names of “famous ministers of the Church of England”* whose “very presence amongst us has been a standing protest against any notion that inquiry and the fearless love of truth can be inconsistent with the Gospel which we preach.” The list of names might be greatly extended. If account be taken of the eminent Englishmen of the century in every department of the national life, it will be found that the Church of England numbers most and the greatest of them among its sons. It is not so elsewhere, at least in the same measure.

“To whom does France owe that part of her civilisation which enables her at the present time to rank among other great nations?”—writes “a sincere and liberal Roman Catholic” who was an eye-witness of the Vatican Council—“I mean her culture, her science, her industry, and her material prosperity.

* The Archbishop limited himself to those who were no longer living. He mentioned Whately, Arnold, Hare, Maurice, and Robertson. We may add the names of Kingsley, Thirlwall, Stanley, Hort, and Lightfoot as not less eloquent of “sound learning” and intellectual honesty.

Beginning from the encyclopædists down to the learned men of the present day, how many of the *savants*, and of those who have in any way assisted the growth of modern France, would have been recognised by Rome as her children? How many laws, how many institutions, and what amount of learning would of necessity have been lost to France had the voice of Rome prevailed in that country? Imagine the consequences to France as regards culture and science had her intellectual progress been subjected for a century to the corrections and revisions of the Roman Index? What part can the influence of Catholicism (using the term in the very sense adopted by its own party), what part can that influence claim in the civil glory and intellectual progress of France? So far we have considered her under the aspect in which she equals the most cultivated and civilised nations of the world; but, at the same time, what nation is more deeply affected than France by grave and serious social questions, or is in a condition less favourable for their resolution?"*

Certainly this challenge has lost nothing in the course of the twenty-five years which have elapsed since it was first proposed. When we seek the causes of that happy "Treuga Dei" which reigns in England between the Christian Religion and modern thought we are at once led to the national establishment, as in great measure responsible. For the English establishment has de-clericalised the clergy beyond all precedent or parallel. It is not necessary to question or belittle the mischiefs which from this circumstance have arisen to religion: at present it is more important to point out the still more considerable advantages.

"The ministers of the Established Church have a mission to the whole nation," and this fact is remembered by the parishioners when it has failed from the mind of the parish priest. In spite of himself he must grow greater

* *Eight Months in Rome during the Vatican Council*, by POMPONIO LETI. London. John Murray, 1876. It would be an easy task to multiply similar declarations from eminent Frenchmen who were not Roman Catholics.

than his professional character may seem to require. His interests cannot be confined to ecclesiastical channels: his sympathies cannot lag behind his responsibilities, and they are co-extensive with the entire life of the people.

Three circumstances have ministered to the distinctive type of the Anglican pastor. The normal training of the English clergy, at school and university, is entirely non-professional. Hence they are the most theologically ignorant and the best educated ministry in existence, and the worst informed on all matters of ecclesiastical technique; but hence also they are the most vigorous and healthy in moral tone, and the sanest in political action. They think, and speak, and act in ways which are essentially similar to those of their Christian neighbours, to whom accordingly they are intelligible. Again, the clergy are, as a rule, married men.* Here also there are obvious drawbacks: marriage means necessarily secularity of tone, and a narrowing of the social connections of the clergy. The very essence of caste is hereditary succession to status: and their marriage imposes on the English clergy a quasi-caste character, which is not pleasing or helpful. The political influence of the clergy, as distinguished from that of the Church, is greatly weakened by the fact that they are drawn from a very small section

* It is certain that Religion suffers great damage from (a) improvident, (β) unsuitable marriages. As to the first, it is to be feared that as the clergy are drawn from a lower social stratum, so they will tend to be poorer, and to marry at an earlier age. As to the second, there is much to be said for Elizabeth's attempt to regulate clerical marriage. "Because there hath grown offence, and some slander to the Church, by lack of discreet and sober behaviour in many ministers of the Church, both in choosing of their wives and indiscreet living with them," it is enacted that no clergyman shall take a wife without "the advice and allowance first had upon good examination" of the bishop and two justices. (*v.* Injunctions of 1559, No. 29.) It is astonishing with what bitterness the parson's wife is sometimes regarded, and not always without cause. On the other hand, there are numberless examples of parochial devotion among clergymen's wives. Cf. JOSEPH ARCH'S *Autobiography*, pp. 7, 17, 50 fol.

of society, being indeed largely drawn from the clerical order itself. But here also the advantages preponderate. The moral tone of a celibate clergy is certainly harder, coarser, and lower than that of a clergy which is free to marry, and is in fact, for the most part, married. In country parishes the clergyman's household sometimes sets an example of domestic virtue before the district; and it is certain that no barrier is more effectual against certain characteristic superstitions and tendencies of the clerical order than that provided by the purifying affections and sobering cares of family life. Marriage is not excessively described by Coleridge as—

“that bond, which more than all other ties connects the citizen with his country; which beyond all other securities affords the surest pledge to the State for the fealty of its citizens, and that which . . . enables the State to calculate on their constant adhesion to its interests, and to rely on their faith and singleness of heart in the due execution of whatever public or national trust may be assigned to them.”*

Finally, the English clergyman, trained as a layman, living essentially as a layman, *i.e.* surrounded by the comforts and burdened by the anxieties of home, is fixed by the law in his benefice with a security which is as nearly that of absolute ownership as the case admits. Short of idiotcy, bankruptcy, or crime, the parish priest can hold his “living” against aggrieved parishioners, indignant patrons, and an outraged bishop.† It is manifest that this “freehold” in an office which carries cure of souls may easily minister to portentous scandals: it is, indeed, patently indefensible, and ought to be terminated; but none the less it would be equally foolish and false

* *v. Church and State*, p. 91. [4th edition.]

† Recent legislation has sharpened the sword of the magistrate against the *scandalous* clergy, who are happily few in number, but provides no remedy against the *incompetent*, who are far more numerous than is either safe or right. The “freehold” directly fosters clerical indolence.

to ignore the incidental advantages of the anomaly. Securely planted in the parishes the clergy contract local friendships and enter with zest and intelligence into local life. The independence secured to them by their position operates as a safeguard against the time-serving pliancy characteristic of a merely salaried ministry, and forms a continually active check on the inevitable tendency towards hierarchical self-assertion within the Church. The English clergy, then, lie open to the influences of their time in an exceptional degree; and they are thus specially qualified to sustain the tradition of intellectual liberty which is the characteristic note of Anglicanism. Anti-clericalism such as is indigenous within the Roman Catholic sphere is still unknown in England. The clergyman is a man and a citizen.

The historic condition of Anglicanism has been Dissent from the Anglican Church. The only possible basis of a properly national religion would have been some variety of comprehensive Protestantism.* So long as the notion of a National Church in the strict sense was dominant in English politics the State oscillated between Protestantism and persecution. The victory of Anglicanism meant also the victory of Dissent, and the dream of a National Church which should reflect and express the national religion expired with the advent of toleration. It is significant that the panic-born legislation of the Caroline settlement cumbered the Statute-book for less than a generation,† and that the

* Cf. Dr. Gardiner's remark on the canon of 1640, which embodied the Laudian system in the matter of ceremonies: "In the British Isles at least no one, with the exception of some few despised Separatists, had seriously advocated the idea that worship was to be tolerated outside the National Church. What was fatal to the canon on the ceremonies was that the worship which it advocated was not in any sense national."—*History*, vol. ix. p. 144.

† Act of Uniformity, 1662; Five Mile Act, 1665; Conventicle Act, 1670. These were practically superseded so far as Dissenters are concerned by the Toleration Act, 1689.

Church, which seemed irrevocably committed to intolerance, became almost immediately the most liberal in Christendom. No account of the English Reformation can exclude the astonishing phenomenon of English Dissent. The reformed Church could not retain the allegiance of a large part of the nation, but the fact did not involve in the minority any opposition to Christianity as such. The sacred claims of Christ's Religion were not in such sense bound up with submission to the Church of England as that no middle course was possible between accepting or rejecting both. In England it was possible to criticise and disobey the Church without *ipso facto* passing over into the camp of unbelief. The consequences of this insular distinction between Christianity and the Church have been important and beneficent in the national history. Politically, socially, spiritually England owes much to the non-episcopal denominations: the Church of England owes to them hardly less. They at least have preserved Anglicanism from ossifying into a mere national tradition, and have held the Church of England, even against its will, true to that *via media* of sound learning which is the distinctive note of the English Reformation. Nor has the influence of the Church of England been slight or valueless on the religious bodies which have gone forth from its pale. Few candid Dissenters would dispute Macaulay's balanced statement that

"while all the qualities of Christian pastors are to be found in large measure within the existing body of Dissenting ministers," yet "that the standard of intellectual and moral character among that exemplary class of men may have been raised to its present high point and maintained there by the indirect influence of the Establishment."

Certainly Dissenters have, with some notable exceptions, contributed comparatively little to the sum of our

theological literature; they have gone for teaching to the discarded Mother Church, and their spiritual victories reflect a measure of credit on the communion from which they originally sprang. A broad view of Anglicanism must take account of this immense indirect influence of the Church of England. There is nothing parallel to it elsewhere. Dissidents from Rome are enemies of Religion; from Wittenberg or Geneva, agnostics or materialists; from Canterbury, earnest and enthusiastic allies in the great cause of Christianity. It may be pardoned if Anglicans find in this singular and honourable distinction no mean testimony to the truth and value of the position which the English Church maintains.

2. The Church of England, thus unique in her constitution and position, at once Catholic, reformed, national, established, and beyond all precedent or example free, seems marked out by Providence for great designs in the future. The sense of destiny has been deeply felt by the most eminent and representative Churchmen of the time. Events appear to be visibly converging to one result, and that an immense demand on the Church of the English people. Twelve years ago the present writer stood within the noble parish church of Wolverhampton, and heard from the lips of Bishop Lightfoot a sermon which to him and to many others was a revelation of the possibilities of Anglicanism. Since 1887 much has happened to illustrate, justify, and extend the argument of that sermon. Four supreme and pressing duties face the modern Church, and with respect to them all the Church of England seems to hold a position of special advantage suggestive of large hopes. The conversion of the world has been brought into the foreground of Christian thought by the course of recent politics, which has, almost suddenly, drawn within the direct influence of the Western Powers practically the whole of non-Christian

humanity. Great Britain has led the van of imperial expansion, and appropriated inevitably the lion's share of its gains. Nearly the whole evangelistic effort of Western Christendom proceeds under the ægis of the British flag. The Church of England cannot surrender its inalienable and ennobling right to represent in a unique degree the spiritual influence of the English people. The position of supreme opportunity which in the fifth and following centuries was held by the Imperial Church of Rome with respect to the pagan continent of Europe, by virtue of which that Church became the spiritual mother of European Christendom, has now found a parallel in the position of supreme opportunity which is held by the Imperial Church of England with respect to the pagan continents of Asia and Africa. The Church of the English Diaspora would seem to be sufficiently designated for the evangelisation of the world. Archbishop Benson summed up the conviction which is forming in many minds when he declared his belief that the Church of England was "now charged with the world's Christianity."*

The very magnitude and urgency of the evangelistic duty now imposed on the Christian Church have forced to the front the practical mischiefs of religious division. Pious men lament the frightful degradation of Christian character under the influence of chronic controversy. Charitable men bewail the superfluous stumbling-blocks thrust in the way of the unconverted. Reasonable men protest against the reckless waste of resources involved in the overlapping of spheres, the excessive multiplication of agents in certain districts, and the diversion of labour from evangelistic to merely sectarian objects.† Hence the generation which has awaked to a consciousness of

* *Life*, vol. i. p. 385.

† *v. Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelisation of the Non-Christian World*, by R. N. CUST, LL.D. London, 1894. A most painful, luminous, and humiliating book.

missionary opportunity has chafed against the scandal and weakness of religious division. The reunion of Christendom has become an object of ardent desire. Of one Church, the Church of Rome, it must be said that by arrogating to itself a monopoly of the Catholic name, and constituting submission to its claims the prime condition of salvation, it has forfeited the possibility of ministering to the cause of ecclesiastical reunion. Historically the Papacy has been, and actually it is at this moment, the most formidable obstacle to religious unity. The Protestant Churches, with the exception of the Presbyterian, do not seem well suited for this task. Their centrifugal tendencies are too potent and incalculable; their theology is too vague and fluid; their traditions are too anarchic. Oriental Christendom, including the great national Church of Russia, will hardly *initiate* any movement of reunion. The Church of England seems here also to be well placed for reconciling the Churches. Its firm hold of Catholic principles, its national character, its affinity with the Churches of the Reformation as being itself reformed, its traditions of theological tolerance, unite to qualify the English Church for the sublime rôle of ecclesiastical peacemaker.

Beneath ecclesiastical questions are theological; under and beyond the clash of open controversy proceeds the torture of intellectual perplexity. Can it be denied that both the conscience and the intellect of Europe are largely alienated from the Churches? As Christianity expands among the uncivilised and semi-civilised peoples, is it losing ground among the civilised? Do the converts in Asia and Africa outweigh the apostates in Europe?

“Voici près d’un siècle que la France et l’Europe sont en quête d’un dieu nouveau et cherchent à tous les vents l’écho de la bonne nouvelle à venir. Elles ont besoin de cette bonne nouvelle, non point seulement parce qu’il faut une

foi à l'humanité, mais surtout parce qu'il lui faut une règle. Toute religion qui s'engouffre, fût-ce au profit d'une foi meilleure, entraîne un temps la morale dans l'abîme, et la conscience moderne, en déracinant le christianisme, s'est déracinée elle-même."

M. Darmesteter, from whose preface to his admirable little treatise on *Les Prophètes d'Israël* we have borrowed, applies to our age the language of the earliest of the canonical prophets.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord: and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even unto the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it. In that day shall the fair virgins and the young men faint for thirst" (Amos viii. 11-13). "Et aujourd'hui aussi," he adds, "les belles jeunes filles et les jeunes gens regardent en vain d'une mer à l'autre: de nul rocher ne jaillit la source où étancher la soif de l'âme: la parole divine n'est point dans l'Ibsen et elle n'est point dans Tolstoï même, et ni du Nord ni du Levant ne vient la lumière."

Such language is thoroughly representative of our time, and it expresses a fact of the utmost gravity. No one can have any acquaintance with cultivated and thoughtful men without becoming painfully conscious of the utter inadequacy of the traditional theology for the satisfaction of their moral and intellectual difficulties. The doubts of the educated reappear as the jests of the ignorant: the rift between the modern mind and conscience and current religion extends through all classes of society. Christianity, in fine, to adopt a now common expression, must be re-stated if the allegiance of Europe is to be retained or recovered. We have already dwelt on that adherence to "sound learning" which is the distinctive principle of the English Reformation and the most precious of Anglican traditions. The Church of England faces the problems of our time with the rooted convictions that they are

capable of solution, and that they ought to be solved. To take but a single example. Contrast the Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII.* on "the Study of Holy Scripture" with the action of the English Church with respect to the same subject.† While the one Church reiterates at the end of the nineteenth century the intolerable doctrine of the sixteenth, the other boldly takes in hand its venerated Bible and, calling to the task the best critical science of the time, revises the whole with immense labour and transparent honesty. This is a typical illustration of the attitudes towards modern problems held respectively by the rival Churches. The welcome given to such books as Canon Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, published in 1891, and now in its seventh edition, and Canon Gore's *Lux Mundi*, published in the preceding year, and since republished frequently, indicates a healthy liberality of thought among Anglican Churchmen, and no mean level of intellectual courage. If Christian doctrine is to be successfully re-stated in terms acceptable to the modern intellect and the modern conscience, it seems no extravagant assumption that the Church of England must take a leading part in the great work. Finally, there is the tendency, which shows itself in every part of Western Christendom, and which insists on holding Christianity very closely to the actual course of human life. Partly

* The Pope rehearses and confirms the dogmatic decrees of the Councils of Florence, Trent, and the Vatican, and adds, "Almost no account should be paid to the circumstance that the Holy Ghost should have taken men as the instruments to write, as some false opinion might be emitted, not certainly by the first author, but by inspired writers." It is mere mockery to exhort to the study of Scripture under these conditions.

† It is particularly noteworthy that the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation has recommended the public use of the Revised Version in the churches. As a matter of fact the Authorised Version is being steadily displaced though slowly. The poverty, not the bigotry of the parish clergy, is the main obstacle to change. If lectern copies could be provided free of charge for the country parishes a very desirable process would be facilitated.

bred of a reaction from theology, partly the creature and witness of the greatly enhanced possibilities of life under the conditions of modern civilisation, this social and even socialistic ideal has laid firm hold on the Christian imagination, and will alter many things, possibly for the better. It may, perhaps, be maintained that Christian Socialism, in so far as it is a legitimate thing, will find no better instrument by which to obtain any measure of practical success, than the parochial system of the Church of England. In any case, a Church so placed as the Church of England can bring the influence of Christianity to bear over a wider area of the national life than any of the Nonconformist denominations, however zealous and successful. As an Establishment the Church significantly embodies that doctrine of State obligation which inspires the generous projects of modern reformers.

Thus the Church of England, in spite of very obvious faults and in face of many serious scandals, is rich in large hopes. There is some danger, perhaps, that these may not be sufficiently remembered at a time of exceptional unrest, when passions are deeply stirred and the balance of men's judgment is disturbed by the excitements and antipathies of controversy. Therefore it appears a serviceable thing to recall the broad and permanent aspects of Anglicanism to the public mind. It cannot escape the thoughtful student of English life that to an extent which it is difficult to exaggerate the best possibilities of Anglicanism are very closely associated with a jealous retention of the historic status of the Church of England. It is, of course, true that the vitality of the spiritual society is independent of political connections: the Church of Christ has an indestructible life, and will in the future as in the past survive the worst disasters which the hatred of the open enemy or the more destructive enmity of the domestic foe can bring on Religion. The State could not

give and cannot take away the grace of Sacraments, the guidance of the Inspiring Spirit, the protection of Christ's promises; but we shall have studied Christian history to little effect if we have not realised the dependence of the Divine Society in a given time and place upon its terrestrial circumstances. Churches fail, but the Church endures. We must not encourage ourselves in a reckless indifference to probable consequences of ecclesiastical action by appropriating to the Church of England those ample assurances which only belong to that greater Society, of which the Church of England is but a part. We should be vigilant to mark "the signs of the times," and not lightly to ignore the evident leadings of Providence. The fact that establishment is plainly ministerial to ends which all must admit to be spiritually important must be no mean indication that it represents the Will of God. That personal preferences of a legitimate, and even of a laudable character should be crossed and restrained by the State-connexion is a small set-off against the substantial advantages to the work of the Church which are by that very circumstance secured. Self-suppression is the law of individual Christianity: and the disciple never comes nearer to spiritual disaster than when he repudiates this cardinal fact of his religious life. May it not be so in the case of the Church? Ecclesiastical self-suppression, also, may be directly serviceable to the best interests of Christianity. It is certain that the opposite temper has brought vast evils on Religion. May it not be the case that in transferring their zeal from what are called the "rights" of the Church to the humbler but more vital concerns of spiritual duty, in the true sense of the word, Churchmen will best secure not merely peace, though that is much, but also all that the Church's "rights" rightly include?

II.

Establishment

BY THE REV. H. HENSLEY HENSON

I.

THE Divine Founder of the Christian Church has left us in no doubt as to the character of that Society. On more than one occasion He sharply distinguished it from the familiar type of terrestrial societies. In using conventional expressions with respect to it, He was watchful to guard Himself against conventional understandings. If He called the Church His "Kingdom," He was careful to add that it was "not of this world":* if He spoke of positions of authority within that Kingdom, "seats on His right hand and on His left hand in His glory," He immediately explained that these dignities did not correspond to the dreams of earthly ambition. The system of the Gentiles was not the counterpart of the system of His Kingdom, nor was the basis of honour the same. He significantly pointed to Himself, the King, and warned His followers to correlate with the witness of His life their notions of His Kingdom. "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them: and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall

* S. John xviii. 36. Cf. Phil. iii. 20.

be your minister: and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." * He certainly established within the Church a ministry,† ruling by the title of a Divine Commission,‡ and specifically empowered to exercise a disciplinary control over His disciples,§ but as certainly He refused to authorise in the case of that ministry those hierarchical pretensions which were conspicuously characteristic of the established Jewish Religion.|| He expounded the constitution, scope, purpose, fortune, and destiny of His Church in a series of parables; He provided for its coherence and order, not only by appointing the Apostolic ministry, but also by instituting the two "Sacraments of the Gospel," solemn public ceremonies of admission into the Church, and perpetual re-affirmation of membership. Thus He created the relations out of which, in the course of time, the problems of "Establishment" have emerged. For an ordered, visible Church, bound together by sacramental bonds, and subject to a divine law of conduct, could not escape the necessity of intercourse with the powers of human society. Christ nowhere speaks precisely on this subject, but He everywhere contemplates it, and on many occasions seems to put forward broad principles for the future guidance of His disciples. Thus He indicates by suggestive metaphors the distinctiveness and ubiquity of the Church as an influence within the mass of the human race. On the one hand the Christian society is "the light of the world," comparable in its clear-cut distinctiveness to "a city set on a hill"; on the other hand it is the "salt of the earth,"

* S. Mark x. 35-45.

† *Ibid.*, iii. 14.

‡ S. John xx. 21; cf. S. Matt. xviii. 19, 20; Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11.

§ S. Matt. xviii. 15-20; cf. 1 Cor. v. 3-5. || St. Matt. xxiii. 1-12.

likened in the silence and universality of its operations to the "leaven" in a lump of dough.* It is evident on the surface of the evangelic history that Christ contemplated the sharpest antagonism between the Church and the established powers of human society. The latest utterances recorded in the Synoptic Gospels and in the record of S. John are sombre with prophecies of persecution. While, however, He thus foresaw an immediate future of heavy trial, it is equally evident that He declared the indestructible vitality of the afflicted Church and her ultimate triumph. For He explicitly assured His disciples of the perpetual presence in their midst of a Divine Power—the Spirit of Truth, the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete—who should console, teach, sanctify, and strengthen them throughout history.† Thus the historic Society was by the Founder described as a Divinely-protected, Divinely-ordered, Divinely-inspired thing, destined through much tribulation, manifold failure, and (what is not less plainly declared) reiterated apostasy to achieve the conquest of the human race, and to fulfil the purpose of the Redemptive Charity of the Eternal.

The precepts of Christ must always be read in the light of His example. While He was actually engaged in training the apostles for their momentous task, and establishing the broad outlines of an organisation which should outlast human society, He was personally subject to the Roman government of Palestine. The claims of that government were at the time much discussed in religious circles: to repudiate them was matter of conscience to many of Christ's contemporaries: they were formally submitted to Christ's judgment by the representatives of the Jewish Hierarchy. His answer has ever been regarded as a luminous declaration of the

* S. Matt. v. 13-16; xiii. 33.

† S. Matt. xxiv.; S. Mark xiii.; S. Luke xxi.; S. John xiv.-xvi. *passim*.

essential principle at stake in the problems of "Establishment." Holding the silver denarius, stamped with the effigy of Tiberius in His hand, He asked, "Whose is this image and superscription?" and when the Pharisees and Herodians replied that they were "Cæsar's," He rejoined, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."*

The problems of Establishment have all grown out of the central question as to the true boundaries of these high rival claims on Christian allegiance. It is vital to remember that the Divine Founder of the Christian Church established the Divine right of both. The famous passage in S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans in which he declares the religious obligation of obedience to the civil power has its origin and its authority in the doctrine of Christ Himself. "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment."† But it is not less evident that S. Peter and the apostles were faithfully echoing the teaching of their Lord when, on the threshold of Christian history, they gave conspicuous example of disobedience to constituted authority by encountering the prohibition of the high priest with the pregnant declaration, "We must obey God rather than men."‡ The adjustment of these contradictory attitudes of religious submission and conscientious revolt has been the crux of ecclesiastical history from the first century until the present time.

* S. Matt. xxii. 15-22; cf. *Ibid.*, xvii. 24-27.

† Rom. xiii. 1-7; cf. 1 Peter ii. 13-17.

‡ Acts v. 29.

II.

So long as the Church remained a private society the problem of Christian duty was limited to the sphere of social intercourse. S. Paul's Epistles to the Gentile Churches present the picture of the Christian society perplexed and menaced by the inevitable association with its pagan environment. The Christian apologists illustrate the same class of difficulties. The Christian, then, looked out on a society which seemed unalterably hostile. Not merely were the high powers of Church and State opposed to his faith, but the whole custom of society was adverse. The contradiction intruded itself into the privacies of domestic life. The believer was affronted at every turn by the witnesses, cruel or kindly, or depraved or superstitious, of paganism. They faced him in his business, in his politics, in his pleasures, in his home. A man's foes were they of his own household. All avenues to success were barred by some idolatrous demand, and the prevailing fashions of society seemed to the follower of the Crucified irredeemably corrupt. The effect of this sharp antagonism was twofold, on Christian ethics and on the development of the ecclesiastical organisation. With the first we have here no concern, but the latter affected the problem of "Establishment" very seriously. It is no unfair description of the course of events in the first three centuries of the Christian era to say that they witnessed a large transference of the attributes of the Christian society to the clerical order. The process has been often traced, and we need not trace it here. It must suffice to say that partly from the natural effect of persecution in strengthening the executive of the Church, partly from the influence of the analogy, very early insisted upon by Christian writers, between the Christian ministry and the

Hierarchy of the Mosaic system, partly from other causes, the position and claims of the clerical order at the beginning of the fourth century had so developed as to absorb into themselves the whole representation of the Church as against the world. Henceforward the problem changes, or rather it appears in a new sphere. With the conversion of Constantine the social difficulty was largely removed. Society had become to a great extent Christianised, and the burden of persecution had shifted from the Church to her quondam oppressors. The political problem now comes into view. Church and State are well-defined political entities, both highly organised, aggressive, developing, extremely sensitive; and necessarily it is the Church, as an organised government, not as a spiritual society, with which the State has primary concern. The rights of Cæsar and God are severally represented by the executives of State and Church. But the problem was rendered immensely more complex by the fact that the Emperor was also a Christian. There was a contradiction between his official position as the head of the State, and his private position as a member of the Church. It is certain that the dualism was fruitful in anomalies, which became in later ages precedents, and exercised a wide and by no means uniformly beneficial influence on the development of Church and State. The circumstances under which the Roman Empire perished in the West were eminently favourable to that process of clerical aggrandizement, which had already proceeded to great lengths. The Church becomes completely identified with the clergy, and the latter advance into an ever greater prominence. The power of the Bishops wanes before that of the Metropolitans, and this in turn wanes before the rapidly-growing empire of the Popes. The theory of ecclesiastical rights steadily rises; the actual position of the clergy is determined by the conditions of time and place; but the

State always contends at a disadvantage, for while the claims of the Church are enshrined in the policy of an undying order, those of the State are represented by individuals, who, however masterful and wise, can in no way secure the perpetuation of their personal authority.

The circumstances of the Middle Ages directly ministered to that identification of the Church with the clerical order, which had its origin in the practical necessities of government. The clergy throughout the earlier centuries of that long period were the representatives of the highest morality of the time, and the monopolists of knowledge. It seemed the most natural thing in the world to accumulate in their hands all the functions of government. The Church, in the restricted sense of the clerical order, gave better justice than the State, and had nobler conceptions of the ends of government, and kinder methods of enforcing authority. The conflict between the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions becomes acute in the later stages of the period. In the earlier there was on the side of the State no general disposition to restrain the action of an institution so plainly beneficent; and, on the side of the Church, as little disposition to insist upon the extreme consequences of the implied theory of clerical supremacy. Anomalies were tolerated, because principles were not debated and spheres were not defined. But with the Hildebrandine Reformation the simpler and unformulated system of the earlier Middle Ages gave place to a system more precise, logical, and effective, but providing at every turn opportunities of friction between Church and State. The ambition of the Roman Pontiffs co-operated with the professional instincts of the great mediæval canonists to develop the clerical theory, until it reached the climax of an absolute superiority both temporal and spiritual, vested in the Popes, and administered through the hierarchy of Christendom. Boniface VIII., in the famous Bull, "Unam

Sanctam," [A.D. 1303], placed the coping-stone on the fabric of hierarchic pretension reared by his predecessors. The independence of the temporal power in its own sphere was explicitly repudiated, and it was declared that no human being could be saved unless he were subject to the Roman Pontiff. The fate of Boniface VIII. illustrates the political resentment provoked by these extravagant claims. The waxing powers of the national monarchies were too strong for the Papacy and the Canonists, and as a matter of fact, the doctrines of the Bull, "Unam Sanctam," though never formally renounced, remained inoperative. The fourteenth century brought into view the far more formidable danger to the mediæval theory which arose from the consciousness that the clerical order personated in the Pope was not morally competent to represent the Christian society. The long conflict between Louis the Bavarian and the Popes of Avignon brought into question the assumptions of papal supremacy, and gave expression to the deep repugnance with which the debasement of the Papacy was regarded by the more cultivated and religious sections of Christendom. It is not sufficiently remembered that the problems which, on the disruption of the Western Church, faced the statesmen of Europe, were rendered the more complex by this two-fold movement, on the one hand political, and on the other moral. The clerical order could never again, without reserve, be identified with the Church, although the same exigencies of government which had in the first centuries compelled that identification, remained unaltered. The post-Reformation doctrines of "Establishment" have been attempts to provide a satisfactory theory to justify existing arrangements, the prime cause and explanation of which are purely historical.

III.

In the course of the Middle Ages the Papacy had absorbed into itself the rights of the whole clerical order, and thus when the course of events in England brought about the definite repudiation of the papal authority, alike in the sphere of temporal and in that of ecclesiastical and spiritual jurisdiction, the existing conceptions on the subject of Church and State were reduced to confusion. The appeal to the primitive Church, which the more scholarly reformers were wont to make, did indeed so far match their necessity, that it exhibited a *præ*-papal phase of Catholicism, but that phase had no counterpart in the actual experience of the Church of England. Cranmer and his allies seemed less historians than antiquarians. They could find basis for themselves in the past only by ignoring a millennium of Church history, and precisely that millennium which embraced the life of the Church of England. During the purely destructive stages of the Reformation the gross anomaly of their position did not seriously trouble them, but on the morrow of the violences which marked the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and the brief reaction of Mary's reign, they found themselves compelled, not less by domestic discontent than by the keen and persistent criticism of the open enemy, to realise the character of all that had happened, and to seek some principles on which so wide a departure from precedent could be justified, and the breach of ecclesiastical unity rendered tolerable.

Three influences determined the theory of the Tudor Churchmen, whose pre-eminent representative was Richard Hooker [1553-1600]. The existing situation was more or less consciously assumed, and the reasoning is plainly affected by the assumption. The primitive Church, by

which was vaguely indicated the præ-mediæval Church which had defined the faith of Christendom in the Œcumenical Councils, provided the historic justifications, and the Old Testament added the religious authority for the established régime. The primitive Church disapproved the papal claims, the Jewish Monarchy authorised the Royal Supremacy and the rigid prohibition of Nonconformity.

"With us," says Hooker, "one society is both the Church and Commonwealth, which with them (*sc.* the primitive Christians) it was not; as also [we differ] from the state of those nations which subject themselves to the Bishop of Rome, in that our Church hath dependency upon the chief in our Commonwealth, which it hath not under him. In a word, our estate is according to the pattern of God's own ancient elect people, which people was not part of them the Commonwealth and part of them the Church of God, but the self-same people whole and entire were both under one chief governour, on whose supreme authority they did all depend."*

As against the Puritans the appeal to the model of the Jewish kingdom was sufficiently cogent, but in itself it was totally unwarrantable, and it certainly led to very unfortunate results.† It authorised an identification of the Church with the nation which was even then plainly contrary to fact, and rested on a disastrous misunderstanding of the spirit of Christianity. Hooker is on stronger ground when he justifies the ecclesiastical action of Parliament on the broad principle that "it is

* *Eccles. Polity*, Book viii. ch. i. 7. The unfortunate circumstances under which Books vi.-viii. were published do not affect their value as representative expressions of current Anglican doctrine, in which aspect alone they here interest us.

† In the second Canon of 1603 excommunication *ipso facto* is pronounced against everyone who affirms "that the King's Majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews and Christian Emperors of the primitive Church." This is in a measure mitigated by Article XXXVII.

the general consent of all that giveth [the decisions of the Church] the form and vigour of laws, without which they could be no more unto us than the counsels of the physicians to the sick." Parliament is not to his thinking a "secular" assembly, but the solemn and constitutional representation of the National Church as a whole, and therefore it is "a court not so merely temporal as if it might meddle with nothing, but only leather and wool."* Warburton's observation is perhaps just. "From right premises the Puritans drew a wrong conclusion, and from wrong premises Hooker drew a right one." The distinctness of Church and State is rooted in the circumstances of the Church's origin, and manifest on the face of society. The contrary assumption was a bold attempt to reconcile the Tudor system with the Christian conscience, but it was repudiated by half the nation at the time, and speedily received final disproof in the calamitous events of the next generation. In the Anglican Church Hooker's doctrine of "Establishment" was quickly displaced by the ecclesiastical revival which marked the early seventeenth century. The divine right of the clerical order was asserted by the Arminian divines on the basis of an appeal to the primitive Church. The King of England was clothed with the attributes of the Roman Augustus. Hence that exalted and unconstitutional theory of the Royal Power which led the Church into great misfortunes, and hampered her influence for many generations. The strong Puritan sympathies of the House of Commons and the personal preferences of the monarchs facilitated the appearance and acceptance of that conception of the Sovereign as the *Episcopus Episcoporum* within his realm, and the transference to him of all the

* *Eccles. Polity*, Book viii. ch. vi. 11: "The Parliament of England, together with the Convocation annexed thereunto, is that whereupon the very essence of all government within this kingdom doth depend."

ecclesiastical authority which Hooker had recognised in Parliament. Charles I.'s famous "Declaration" prefixed to the Articles of Religion in 1628 never so much as mentions the name of Parliament. In orthodox Anglican circles under the Laudian régime the relations between Church and State resolved themselves into the personal relations between the Divinely-ordained Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governour of the Church, on the one hand, and the national hierarchy on the other. When King and Parliament were ranged in open conflict the Church discovered the inability of the Monarchy to justify this exalted theory. Plainly the State with which the Church must reckon could not be simplified into the Sovereign, viewed in his personal aspects as an orthodox Christian and the Lord's anointed. The implication of the Laudian theory of Establishment was an absolute Monarchy, and that was for ever disproved and disallowed by the Great Rebellion.

IV.

The Restoration seemed to bring back unaltered the old constitution in Church and State, but the conditions were no longer the same. The Church, under the coercion of exile and controversy, had developed her own theory: in the standing conflict with Rome—a conflict never waged with greater ardour than at this time when events seemed to have decided the fate of Anglicanism—the great Churchmen of the Laudian school had worked out a quasi-historical case for the Church of England, which, resting on Catholic antiquity, included a very high notion of clerical rights, and, assuming a doubtful version of the history of English Christianity, constructed an imposing scheme of original ecclesiastical independence.* Parlia-

* Cf. BRAMHALL'S *Just Vindication of the Church of England*, chap. iv.: "That the King and Kingdom of England, in the separation from Rome,

ment was no longer the natural object of clerical suspicion. The orthodox ardour of the restored cavaliers outran the desires and even the expectations of the Church. The monarch was a more doubtful element, and in spite of extravagant professions of loyalty it seems clear that the abler Anglican divines were much perplexed as to the possibilities of friction between the Church and the Crown. The learned but eccentric Thorndike [1598-1672] may be taken as the ablest exponent of the prevailing doctrine of Establishment. He lays it down, of course, that "the Church of England giveth to the king that power in Church matters, which the kings of God's ancient people, and Christian emperors after them, always practised,"* but he is evidently dissatisfied with the doctrine, and allows himself to dispute the time-honoured parallel between English and Jewish sovereigns, while he reaches agreement with the practical effect of that parallel by a rather laboured argument of his own. "Acts of Parliament," he says, "cannot be the measure of religion, though they should be the fence and the bulwark of it."† The essence of Establishment consists in the donation of privileges by the State to the Church.

"Any religion is made the religion of any State by two manner of means, that is, of temporal privileges and temporal penalties: for how much toleration soever is allowed several religions in any State, none of them can be counted the religion of the State

did make no new law, but vindicate their ancient liberties" [*Works*, i. p. 129 fol.], where the excellent author will have it that Henry VIII. claimed and exercised no other control over the Church than that possessed by Edward the Confessor (v. p. 151). In the *Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon* much is made of "the Britannic Churches" before A.D. 600, but it is all very doubtful and largely irrelevant (v. *Works*, ii. p. 149 fol.).

* v. THORNDIKE, *Right of the Church in a Christian State*, chap. i. sec. II. [*Works*, vol. i. part ii. p. 404.]

† v. THORNDIKE, *Just Weights and Measures*, chap. iv. sec. I. [*Works*, vol. v. p. 99.]

till it be so privileged as no other can be privileged in that State, though it becomes the religion of that State still more manifestly when penalties are established, either upon the not exercise of the religion established, or upon the exercise of any other beside it." *

In a Church thus established "the right of judging the causes of Christians ceaseth," † and Thorndike would carry amalgamation with the State to the length of employing the clergy in civil matters. ‡ He assumes that a Christian State will necessarily accept the Catholic tradition of faith and discipline, and limits the range of legislation to the task of readjusting that tradition in deference to the changes of national circumstance. As to the method of legislation, he lays it down that "the matter of ecclesiastical laws is determinable by the Church : the force of them, as to such means as the State is able to enact them with, must come from the State." § On the whole Thorndike's theory was fairly illustrated by the practice of his time. The bigotry of James II., a papist monarch, strained the Caroline doctrine of Establishment to breaking point. How irreconcilable had become the duty of patriotism and the requirements of the theory is evident from the history of the Revolution of 1688 and the unhappy schism of the Nonjurors which followed it. The existing constitution of the country was radically revised on the basis of that convenient fiction, the Original Contract. It followed necessarily that the change extended to the theory of Establishment.

* *v. Right of the Church*, chap. iv. sec. 63. [*Works*, vol. i. part ii. p. 553.]

† *Of the Laws of the Church*, book iii. ch. xxiii. [*Works*, vol. iv. part ii. p. 845.]

‡ *v. Ibid.*, chap. v. sec. 30. [*Works*, vol. i. part ii. p. 589.]

§ *Ibid.*, chap. iv. sec. 64. [*Works*, vol. i. part ii. p. 554.]

V.

William Warburton [A.D. 1698-1779] is a typical ecclesiastic of the eighteenth century, and his famous treatise on the *Alliance between Church and State*,* published in A.D. 1736, represents the doctrine of Establishment which was paramount in England throughout that period. He was concerned to apply to the existing relations of Church and State that fiction of original contract which had been found so useful by the authors and apologists of the Revolution of 1688. He steered a middle course between the high, rigid notions of the Nonjurors and the laxity of the dominant Whigs.

"The Principles of Society, Civil and Religious, here delivered," he writes,† "will serve to lay open the absurd reasonings of those who, thinking an Establishment of Divine Right, defend it on the doctrine of intolerance, which makes a Church an inquisition; and the necessary consequences deduced from those principles will as plainly expose the mischievous reasonings of those who, holding a Test to be against all human rights, oppose it on a doctrine of licentiousness, which makes the Church a rope of sand. Having done this, from those clear principles and those necessary consequences we shall demonstrate the perfect concord and agreement between religious liberty and a Test Law; and in the last place detect the delusive principle above-mentioned, upon which both parties have gone, and show how it hath led both, as extraordinary as it may seem, to quite contrary conclusions. From all this it will appear, which is one of the principal purposes of this discourse, that our present happy Constitution, both of Church and State, is erected on solid and lasting foundations."

This is a sufficiently ambitious thesis, but Warburton was ambitious to the point of audacity, and he maintains

* I quote from the edition of Warburton's Works, published in London, 1788, vol. iv.

† v. p. 21.

it at length by an argument of great subtlety and force. Throughout his treatise considerations of real weight are mingled with the most arbitrary and even fantastic contentions. He begins by showing the civil worth of Religion as supplying those sacred sanctions to duty which the State is powerless to provide, and which, none the less, society imperatively needs. Then he considers the "nature and end of civil society" and of Religion severally. He sharply distinguishes between the secular and spiritual spheres. This distinction is assumed by his idea of an "Alliance" between Church and State, and is vital to his theory. Both are separate in origin, method, and drift, and both are properly independent. He sweeps aside the current errors of his time.

"The Papist makes the State the creature of the Church; the Erastian makes the Church a creature of the State; the Presbyterian would regulate the State on Church ideas; the Hobbeist, the Church on reasons of State; and, to complete the farce, the Quaker abolished the very being of a Church; and the Mennonite suppresses the office of the civil magistrate."*

Warburton defines the end of civil society as "security to the temporal liberty and property of man," and denies to the magistrate any concern with the salvation of souls, which is the proper end of Religion, or with doctrine and morals, which are the means of Religion. This restriction of sphere,† however, is mitigated by the important exception of "the three fundamental principles of Natural Religion," namely, the Being of God, His providence over human affairs, and the natural essential difference of moral good and evil. These as being "the very foundation and bond of civil policy" the magistrate is bound "to cherish, protect, and propagate." Passing to Religion, Warburton shows on grounds of reason the necessity of that social organisation which historically is coeval with it.

* *v.* p. 36.

† p. 40.

"The Founder of Christianity actually formed our holy Religion into a society, or a common policy, with public rites, proper officers, and a subordination of the Ministry."*

This society is sovereign and independent of the State, for it has no coercive authority, and does not therefore come into contact with the action of the State. The power of excommunication, which is essential to the Church, seems to contradict this, but since excommunication is a purely spiritual act, and the State as such has no right or power to confer religious privileges on anyone, the contradiction is only apparent.

"Admit the religious society to be independent, and you invincibly destroy all pretence to coercive power, because coercive power introduces an *imperium in imperio*, which is removed only by destroying the independency. Admit again, that religious society has no coercive power, and you supersede all the State's claim of dependency—a claim solely founded on the evil of an *imperium in imperio*, which evil can arise no otherwise than by the Church's exercise of an inherent coercive power." †

In the Second Book Warburton applies these principles. The independent powers of Church and State freely enter into an alliance for their mutual advantage. The magistrate seeks thus to preserve the essence and purity of Religion, to improve its usefulness and apply its influence in the best manner, ‡ to prevent the mischief which, in its natural independent state, it might occasion to civil society. The Church finds her motive in the desire to obtain security from all external violence. Warburton is clearly skating on thin ice when, at this point, he disclaims any other motive. The Church, he says, may not "engage the State to propagate the established Religion by force," for that would violate natural right; nor "to bestow honours, riches, and powers upon it," because "these are

* p. 52.

† p. 61.

‡ pp. 85-90.

things which, as a religious society, she can neither use nor profit by." These may indeed follow from the alliance, and "be in the private view of ambitious Churchmen," but they could not be in the motive of the Church, which, as a religious society, consists of the whole body of the community, both laity and clergy. Such being the motives, what are the conditions of this alliance? Broadly Warburton lays down as "the great preliminary and fundamental article" this, "that the Church shall apply its utmost influence in the service of the State and the State shall support and protect the Church."* To effect this there must be a mutual communication of their respective powers, and the surrender of independency by the Church. The Church gains a public endowment for her ministers, seats for the bishops in Parliament, and jurisdiction assisted by co-active powers for reformation of manners: the State gains its supremacy in matters ecclesiastical. Warburton† shows "that the Christian Religion is, of all other, best fitted for such an alliance with the State as may be most productive of their mutual advantage, and that our own is the most perfect of all Christian Establishments." Such defects as we have are due "to the unfinished parts of an excellent model, which the misfortunes of Edward VI.'s reign prevented from being carried to perfection. For then it was that this alliance between the Protestant Church of England and the State was made, on the natural dissolution of the alliance between the popish Church and it." In the Third Book Warburton deals with the Test Law, which he describes as both necessary and equitable: the first because the Church having surrendered her independence is helpless against the hostile action of her enemies in the magistrature, the last because it secures that State pro-

* Chap. iii., "Of the Reciprocal Terms and Conditions of this Alliance."

† p. 140 fol.

tection which was the stipulated price of that voluntary surrender. Incidentally it is pointed out that "the alliance between Church and State is perpetual, but not irrevocable, *i.e.* it subsists just so long as the Church thereby established maintains its superiority of extent; which, when it loses to any considerable degree, the alliance becomes void."* Certain obvious objections to his argument are discussed with more skill than success, and the treatise concludes with some general observations.†

"I will conclude, in requesting my reader to have this always in mind, that the true end for which religion is established is, not to provide for the true faith, but for civil utility, as the key to open to him the whole mystery of this controversy—and the clew to lead him safe thro' all the intricacies and perplexities, in which it has been involved."‡

He indignantly repudiates, as "a very gross calumny," the suggestion that his theory "makes religion a tool of politics" in the sense of "a convenient engine to ambitious and intriguing politicians to work the clergy, as the tools of power, in a separate interest from the community," and maintains that "so far is this plan of alliance from contributing to those mischiefs, that it effectually prevents them; and, what is more, is the only scheme of an Establishment which can prevent them." This characteristic boast has not been justified by events. The impartial historian will certainly find in the history of the eighteenth century the sufficient condemnation of Warburton's skilful and, from the standpoints of his time, plausible theory.§ Its vices are apparent to the modern

* So PALEY [*Works*, ii. p. 47]: "If the Dissenters from the Establishment become a majority of the people, the Establishment itself ought to be altered or qualified." † WARBURTON, *l.c.* p. 240. ‡ pp. 243-4.

§ Dr. ARNOLD, by no means disposed to unduly depreciate an age which, with all its faults, was neither narrow nor superstitious, describes the time well in the Preface to his *Sermons*, published 1841: "At this moment men are truly craving something deeper than satisfied the last century; they crave to have the true Church of Christ, *which the last century was without*."—p. xliii.

thinker : it is based on a fiction ; it is everywhere artificial ; and throughout it is coloured by that curious optimism which marked its author's generation. It is an impressive comment on the description of the Establishment as ideal that the relations of Church and State had in one direction reached a deadlock, the Convocations being, for all practical purposes, permanently prorogued from A.D. 1717 ; the Wesleyan movement showed how inefficiently the national services of the Church were fulfilled. The excellences of Warburton's view are now perhaps insufficiently recognised, and beyond doubt its influence on English opinion has been, and still is, very considerable.

VI.

The convenient fictions of the eighteenth century, together with the shallow optimism and easy tolerance which generated and maintained them, perished in the storms of the French Revolution. In England the protracted conflict with France, which, however its true character may have been obscured at the start, did certainly in its later stages wear the aspect of a struggle for national independence, threw into the background the issues which here, as elsewhere, rose into view on the collapse of European society. A double movement manifested itself. On the one hand the imperilled institutions of civilised life were clothed with sacred dignity by the kindled imagination of loyalty. The "Constitution" became the fetish of half the nation precisely when it was sinking under manifest and intolerable abuses. The stately language of Burke invested the "Establishment" with ideal beauty. It was the Sanctuary of the Temple of Order, not to be profaned by the rude entrance of the reformer or desecrated by the repulsive presence of the critic. The conservative reaction which followed hard on the heels

of revolution expressed itself in every direction. Europe rose from the ashes of her self-wrought ruin in order to rebuild her fallen temples, restore her banished gods, call back her perished past. On the other hand, men sought for a new basis of order wherewith to compensate themselves for that which had been tried, found wanting, and destroyed. Institutions were required to justify their existence at the bar of the public conscience. The nineteenth century will have done with fictions and, at all costs, face the facts. It will reverse the old formula, and "walk by sight, not by faith." Hence the conservative reaction, which has re-edified the hierarchies of society, has synchronised with the growth of an exacting and ruthless utilitarianism, the most reasonable and least generous of philosophies. The effect of this twofold movement on the doctrine of Establishment has been direct, powerful, and evident. Three names stand out prominently as representing in various measure the influence of the time—Dr. Chalmers, S. T. Coleridge, and W. E. Gladstone. The Presbyterian rests absolutely on the practical worth of the historic connexion between Church and State.* "I hold the Establishment," he said in 1830 in the course of a sermon preached at the opening of an Independent Chapel in the neighbourhood of Bristol, "to be not only a great Christian good, but one indispensable to the up-

* Dr. CHALMERS explicitly identifies "Establishment" with "a sure legal provision for the expense" of the Church's ministrations. His *Lectures on the Establishment and Extension of National Churches* are a powerful and eloquent argument for Church Endowments: "Wherever we have a certain legal provision for the ministrations of Christianity there we have an establishment of Christianity in the land. It is this which forms the essence of an Establishment" [*v. Lectures*, p. 6. Glasgow, 1838]. PALEY uses similar language [*Works*, ii. p. 36. London, 1837] in Book vi. chap. x. of his *Moral and Political Philosophy*: "The division of the country into districts, and the stationing in each district a teacher of religion, forms the substantial part in every Church Establishment. The varieties that have been introduced into the government and discipline of different Churches are of inferior importance when compared with this, in which they all agree."

holding of a diffused Christianity throughout the land." His ardent imagination was set on fire by his religious zeal. He was the prince of parish priests, contemptuous of small issues, absorbed in the practical working of the system he found to his hand, indifferent to anomalies, and patient of abuses.

"In spite of all the imputations and errors, which its greatest enemies have laid to the door [of the Established Church], we hold that on the alternative of its existence or non-existence, there would hang a most fearful odds to the Christianity of England. We are ready to admit that the working of the apparatus might be made greatly more efficient, but we at the same time contend that, were it taken down, the result would be tantamount to a moral blight on the length and breadth of our land. We think it might be demonstrated that were the ministrations of your Established Church to be done away they would never be replaced by all the zeal, energy, and talent of private adventurers. Instead of the frequent parish church, that most beautiful spectacle to a truly Christian heart, because to him the richest in moral associations, with the tower peeping forth from amidst the verdure of the trees in which it is embosomed, there would be presented to the eye of the traveller only rare and thinly-scattered meeting-houses. The cities might indeed continue to be supplied with regular preaching, but innumerable villages and hamlets, left dependent on a precarious itinerancy, would be speedily reduced to the condition of a moral waste. Our peasants would again become Pagans, and under the name and naked form of Christianity, would sink into the blindness and brutishness and sad alienation of Paganism."*

This is an eloquent and effective plea for the working adjuncts of Establishment—an endowed clergy and a parochial system—rather than an argument for Establishment itself. Dr. Chalmers, indeed, had a very insufficient grasp of the principles at stake. In the spring of 1838 he delivered a series of lectures in London on "The True

* *Memorials of Dr. Chalmers*, by W. HANNA. Edinburgh, 1851, vol. iii. p. 266.

Theory of Religious Establishment.” His audience consisted of the leading representatives of Metropolitan culture and piety. Nine prelates of the Church of England and at least 500 peers and members of Parliament are said to have attended his concluding lecture. The enthusiasm of the great orator extended itself to his audience, and it was unbounded; but the crux of the problem was shelved. While dealing with the objection that the connection between Church and State necessarily implied a vitiating or secularising of Christianity, Dr. Chalmers quoted a conversation which he had had with an American clergyman, who said to him—

“‘If all you mean by an Establishment is an organised provision for a clergy, we should rejoice in it. The thing we deprecate is the authority of the civil magistrate in matters of religion.’ ‘Now this,’ said Dr. Chalmers, ‘this organised provision is truly all that we contend for. It is just, in other words, a legal provision for the support of a Christian ministry, an arrangement which might truly be gone into without the slightest infringement on the spiritual prerogatives of the Church or the ecclesiastical independence of her clergymen. In respect of this ecclesiastical independence, I am not aware of any serious practical obstacle to the exercise of it in England; and, at all events, we know of nothing more perfect in this respect than the constitution of the Church of Scotland. There is, to each of its members, an independent voice from within: and from without, there is no power or authority whatever in matters ecclesiastical.’”*

While thus the great Presbyterian, in his zeal for the work of the Church, ignored the latent difficulties of the situation, his Anglican contemporaries, disdaining considerations of expediency, were subjecting the time-worn system of the Establishment to the severe criticism of their high ecclesiastical theory. It is deeply significant that within a few years of his impassioned advocacy of the

* *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 44.

existing régime Dr. Chalmers was leading a movement of separation.

Coleridge's treatise *On the Constitution of Church and State*, originally published in 1830, has been frequently reprinted, and has, probably, influenced modern opinion on the subject of "Establishment" more than any other work.* It is remarkable that, though the spirit of the two men was as widely opposed as possible, there is a close resemblance between the views of Coleridge and Warburton. In both writers we find a clear and emphatic assertion of the essential distinctness of the Church and the State; both dwell much on the indispensableness of the Church to the State; both distinguish between the Church of Christ and the National Church, which may or may not be Christian. Coleridge may be said to adapt the "Alliance" to modern conditions. The "Test Act," which to the Georgian prelate was the necessary palladium of Establishment, had been abolished; Roman Catholic Emancipation had still further disturbed the bases of the constitution. The philosopher seeks, in the region of essential ideas, a new principle on which to justify a continuance of the historic relations between Church and State. The idea of the State properly includes that of the National Church, and this idea has found historic expression in the general reservation of property for the maintenance of a permanent class or order, the clerisy, clerks, or Church of the nation.

"This class comprised the learned of all denominations, the professors of all those arts and sciences the possession and application of which constitute the civilisation of the country. Theology formed only a part of the objects of the National Church."

* Cf. *Encyclopædia Brit.*, art. "Coleridge." "This doctrine . . . has long been adopted by those who desire to preserve the endowments of Establishments." This, however, is an exaggeration.

As a matter of fact, however, theology now remains practically the sole object, for the representatives of all other learning and science have found it more advantageous to desert the ranks of the national clergy. This, while it may diminish the influence and restrict the action of the latter, cannot affect its rights.

"I do not assert that the proceeds from the Nationalty cannot be rightfully vested except in what we now mean by clergymen and the established clergy. I have everywhere implied the contrary. But I do assert that the Nationalty cannot rightfully be, and that without foul wrong to the nation it never has been, alienated from its original purposes."*

Coleridge faces the question, "In what relation do you place Christianity to the National Church?" and he answers that

"in relation to the National Church, Christianity or the Church of Christ is a blessed accident, a providential boon, a grace of God, a mighty and faithful friend, the envoy, indeed, and liege subject of another State, but which can neither administer the laws nor promote the ends of this other State, which is not of the world, without advantage, direct or indirect, to the true interests of the States, the aggregate of which is what we mean by the world, that is, the civilised world."†

The interlacement of characters in an established Christian Church is extremely complex; confusion is easy, and has been general. The "four distinctions, or peculiar and essential marks, by which the Church with Christ as its head is distinguished from the National Church, and separated from every possible counterfeit that has or shall have usurped its name,"‡ have been constantly obscured, but broadly "the perfection of the

* *Church and State*, 4th ed., p. 59.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 65, 66.

‡ These are : (1) The Christian Church is not a kingdom of the world, and (2) not a secret community. (3) It has no visible head or local or personal centre of unity. (4) It is universal.—*v. Ibid.*, p. 138 fol.

National Church is to afford every opportunity, and to present no obstacle to a gradual advancement of the Church of Christ."*

It is evident that all Coleridge's premisses might be admitted by the advocate of Disestablishment. To chain his generous conception of the national clerisy to so relatively insignificant a factor in the national life as the established clergy is to stamp his argument as merely polemical, designed with a view to immediate political exigencies. He is still in the bondage of the pre-historic epoch, and his pages positively bristle with fictions and assumptions. His "Nationalty" is as purely imaginative as Warburton's "Alliance." Both are arbitrary creations, and have no historic basis. Nearly all the functions of his "National Church" have been transferred elsewhere; only religion remains, and half the religion of England is outside the Established Church. If the existing connection between Church and State is to be maintained it must be on some more modest ground.

In 1838—the very year when Dr. Chalmers was electrifying the fashionable world of London by his lectures on "The True Theory of Religious Establishment"—Mr. Gladstone's famous treatise on *The State in its Relations with the Church* issued from the Press. It represents the mental attitude of the Oxford Tractarians, and marks the high-water level of its author's conservatism. The root of his theory is the doctrine of the National Conscience. A nation is truly a person, and as such bound by the obligation not only to believe the truth but to propagate it. This obligation cannot be left to the voluntary action of individuals, because, apart from the implied dereliction of national duty, such action is determined by the desire for religious provision, and that is precisely weakest where religious necessity is greatest.

* *Ibid.*, p. 155.

It is obvious that this view of the subject now commands the acceptance of nobody. It is frankly mediæval; it logically involves the proscription of error and the persecution of dissent; it has long since been abandoned by its author. It is far more obsolete than the theories of Thorndike and Warburton. Its principal interest is that of a landmark by which to measure the march of modern opinion, and the lengths of self-contradiction to which the stress of political exigency can drive a religious politician of the modern type.

VII.

At this point it may be convenient to review shortly the position which has been thus variously defended. It is not without significance that the essential incidents of Establishment must still be sought within the precincts of the sixteenth century. Bishop Stubbs has noticed the contrast herein presented between Church and State.

"We have long rid ourselves of all the secular burdens imposed by what we call the Tudor dictatorship, but we are still living under religious or ecclesiastical conditions that owe very much, even of their present form, to the hand of Henry."*

The Royal Supremacy—not as exemplified in that "Regal Papacy" which only Henry could conceive and none but Henry execute, but as expressed in the great Statutes, which render the Parliament of 1529–1535 perhaps the most important of all Parliaments—became and still remains the characteristic feature of the English Establishment. In 1530 the Convocation of Canterbury, coerced by the threatened enforcement of the penalties of præmunire to which they were by a stretch of legal subtlety exposed, agreed, after much debate, on the formula proposed by Archbishop Warham.†

* *Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, p. 262.

† LATHBURY, *Hist. of Convocation*, p. 102.

"Ecclesiae et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et (quantum per Christi legem licet) etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem cognoscimus."

This guarded statement undoubtedly expressed all, and perhaps more than all, that the clergy could conscientiously concede, but it was unscrupulously simplified in the Reforming Statutes which began, in a long series, to issue from the obsequious Parliament.* The Supremacy Act of 1534 (26 Henry VIII. cap. 1.) formally appointed the king's title in this form, "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia." There can be no question that Henry VIII. interpreted his ecclesiastical Headship in a sense which no Christian conscience could rightly allow. He was, in his own eyes, "the Pope, the whole Pope, and something more than the Pope." But this conception of the Supremacy expired with its author; and even the famous title did not long survive. Mary renounced it, and Elizabeth re-enacted the Supremacy without restoring it. "Mr. Lever wisely put such a scruple into the Queen's head," writes Sandys to Parker, "that she would not take the title of Supreme Head."† It may, indeed, be doubted whether Elizabeth intended any substantial diminution of authority by the change.‡ She repeatedly declared that the government of her father and her brother gave the measure of her own power; and the language of the Supremacy Act [1 Eliz. cap. 1.], 1559, could hardly be expressed in ampler terms. It is, moreover, noticeable that neither Hooker nor Whitgift, when dealing with the Puritan objection to the title, refers to its legal abolition. Both defend it, as if it were properly involved in the actual supremacy

* Henry, however, did give explanations in his letter to Tunstall, Bishop of Durham. He repudiated the powers conferred in Ordination.

† The letter is printed in BURNET'S Appendix.

‡ Cf. "The Explanation of the Oath of Supremacy in the Injunctions of 1559."—GEE and HARDY, *Documents*, p. 439.

vested in the sovereign.* The Caroline divines were more sensitive. Bramhall, for example, asserts that Elizabeth and her immediate successors "thought that name did sound ill, and that it intrenched too far upon the right of their Saviour. Therefore they declined it, and were called only 'Supreme Governors, in all causes, over all persons ecclesiastical and civil,' which is a title *de jure* inseparable from the crown of all Sovereign Princes."†

Circumstances would, however, in any case have been too strong for the Queen's despotic inclinations. Her sex told heavily against her, and as the critical stage of the Reformation gave place to a calmer time, men were able to realise their principles and recover their self-respect.‡ The Royal Supremacy expressed itself notably in the spheres of legislation, the administration of the law, and the appointment of the higher ecclesiastics. The first is dealt with in the Essay on "Convocation," and calls for no mention here. The second raises the most hotly disputed questions of Church politics: the last has perhaps in the past most compromised the reputation of the Establishment.

Professor Maitland has pointed out the effects of the Reformation on the Ecclesiastical Courts.§ It is difficult to exaggerate either the gravity or the extent of the change. Henceforward the Courts had to enforce Acts of

* SANDERS (*The Anglican Schism*, book iv. chap. i.) describes the change in title as a trick to deceive the simple, and points out that the "terms of the oath carried the impiety, and the usurpation of the sovereign ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, much farther than the mere title of head given to the two kings." — Cf. FULLER, *Church Hist. of Britain*, book ix. 5.

† *Works*, vol. i. p. 31: "King Charles did never style himself 'Head of the Church,' nor could with patience endure to hear that title."

‡ Dr. MARTINEAU [*Essays, Reviews, and Addresses*, vol. ii. p. 167] has observed that the Royal Supremacy as explained by Elizabeth "no longer involves anything which the Dissenter of the present day would hesitate to own."

§ *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, p. 90 fol.

Parliament, and to disallow all existing canon law, which ran counter either to such Acts, or to the royal prerogative, or to the customs of the realm. It was declared, and soon became an established legal doctrine, that the Sacred Code of Christendom had never, as such, been binding on the Church and State of England, but owed whatever authority it had to the free acceptance it obtained. Henceforward laymen might be judges.* The study of canon law was prohibited, and that of its historic rival, the civil law, encouraged.

“No step that Henry took was more momentous. He cut the very life-thread of the old learning. The ecclesiastical judges in time to come might administer such of the ancient rules as were not contrariant nor repugnant to the laws (newly interpreted) of God and the statutes of our lord the king: but they would not have been, like their predecessors in time past, steeped and soaked for many a year in the papal law-books and their ultra-papal glosses.”†

The mediæval courts continued, indeed, without specific alteration of name or procedure, but the abolition of the papal jurisdiction necessitated the creation of some alternative. By the Statute for Restraint of Appeals, 1533 (24 Hen. viii. cap. 12), “which embodies the legal principle of the Reformation under Henry VIII.” in a characteristic preamble appeals to Rome were abolished “in causes testamentary, causes of matrimony and divorces, right of tithes, oblations, and obventions,” and it was enacted that in all such cases the king’s subjects should “henceforth take, have, and use their appeals within this realm, and not elsewhere.” Appeals were to lie to the Provincial Courts, whose sentences were final. In causes

* The position of laymen secured under Henry’s supremacy was strikingly affirmed by the precedence given to Thomas Cromwell as Vicar-General over the Primate. He sat on the Episcopal benches in the House of Lords.

† *Ibid.*, p. 92.

touching the king the appeal lay "to the spiritual prelates and other abbots and priors of the Upper House, assembled and convocate by the king's writ in the Convocation being, or next ensuing, within the province or provinces where the same matter of contention is, or shall be, begun."* In the following year the Statute for the Submission of the Clergy (25 Hen. viii. cap. 19) abolished all appeals to the Pope, and provided for appeal from the Provincial Courts "to the king's majesty in the king's Court of Chancery." The king must appoint Commissioners under the great seal to determine the cause. This provision created the tribunal, subsequently known as the Court of Delegates, which, down to the year 1832, was the "Final Court" of the Church of England. So long as the "High Commission" existed the delegates had little to do, but since the Revolution they transacted much and various business.

"The constitution of the court was almost entirely lay, even when dealing with the clergy and clerical offences. Of 109 cases of clerical appeals, from 1586 to 1838, ecclesiastics sat alone in no single one, lay civilians always being present; in eighty-three common law judges also took part, and in fifty-five no one but lay judges appear. Generally a very common proportion was three or four bishops, four common law judges, and four or five civilians. The delegates heard appeals directly from the Arches or Archbishops', and indirectly from the Consistory or Bishops' Courts, and dealt with all kinds of matters coming within the power of those courts, whether civil—such as wills or matrimonial causes—or more distinctly ecclesiastical matters—such as tithe or patronage—and even criminal suits, embracing 'all causes of correction instituted against either clergymen or laymen for any offence against ecclesiastical law'—simony, for

* This provision seems never to have been acted on, but it has great interest and importance as indicating the direction in which possibly a solution might be found for some obstinate difficulties of our own day. Dean Church approved of "a spiritual court of appeal on doctrine and discipline" consisting of bishops either representative or as a body.—*Life and Letters*, p. 282.

instance, or heresy. Of distinctly heresy cases, seven are given by Rothery in his Report, reprinted by the Commissioners in 1883." *

The Court of Delegates was abolished by 2 & 3 Will. IV. cap. 92 in 1832, which transferred the hearing of appeals to the Crown in council. In the following year the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was created, and to that tribunal ecclesiastical appeals were referred in spite of strong clerical protests in and out of Parliament against the total absence of any provision for securing a spiritual element in the Court. By the Church Discipline Act (3 & 4 Vict. cap. 86) passed in 1840 the grievance of the clergy was in large measure redressed. It provided that the archbishops and bishops, being also Privy Councillors, were to be members of the Judicial Committee for purposes of ecclesiastical appeals, and that no such appeals should be heard unless at least one archbishop or bishop were present. It is unquestionable that the ecclesiastical Revival brought back the objections to the Final Court in a novel and more dangerous form; not the exclusion of a spiritual element, but the inclusion was now the subject of clerical complaint. In the famous cases of Mr. Gorham [1850] and *Essays and Reviews* [1864], there had been an apparent collision between the Judicial Committee and the Church on questions of high spiritual importance. As a first step towards securing some protection against what looked like and was generally thought to be an Erastian subordination to the State, the more ardent Churchmen desired to relieve the Church from any complicity with the objectionable Court. "The first and great object is to get the Bishops off the Privy Council on these appeals," wrote

* Mr. Montague Barlow's excellent Essay entitled, "As by Law Established," in the recently published volume *Church and Faith*.

Bishop Wilberforce to Mr. Gladstone in 1861.* "Their presence there gives to the Court the look of an Ecclesiastical Court and so commits us." In the Judicature Act of 1873 [36 & 37 Vict. cap. 66] this object was partially effected by that indefatigable prelate, who persuaded Mr. Gladstone, then at the head of the Government, to transfer ecclesiastical appeals to the new Court of Appeal. Lord Selborne "succeeded in making an arrangement with the two Primates and the Bishop of London (who did not share Bishop Wilberforce's views) for a modification of the Commons' amendments so as to provide for the presence of the Bishops as Assessors in the new Court, and so the Bill passed."† Three years later the Appellate Jurisdiction Act [39 & 40 Vict. cap. 59] again revised the legal system.

"The sole competence of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was restored, the special provision as to the constitution of that committee when determining disciplinary causes against the clergy was repealed, and a general regulation made that a definite number of archbishops and bishops was to be fixed by Order in Council, such archbishops and bishops to attend as assessors at the hearing of all ecclesiastical causes."‡

It will be evident that since the Reformation the final Court of Appeal, though including at divers times a more or less substantial clerical element, has been essentially a lay Court. If this fact seem inconsistent with the inalienable rights of the spiritual society, it must be remembered that the essential doctrines of Christianity are embodied in formularies and enacted in statutes, and that those doctrines are beyond the competence of any national hierarchy to alter. If it be further contended that the task of interpreting those formularies, which

* *Life*, vol. iii. p. 104.

† *v.* Lord SELBORNE'S *Memorials, Personal and Political*, 1865-1895, p. 312.

‡ MAKOWER, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, p. 459.

is the whole extent of the power of the courts, necessarily involves the act of doctrinal determination, that in fine, interpretation is legislation, it must be answered that this is only the case in any noxious degree when formularies are seriously inadequate to express convictions, and have, whether through lapse of time or change of ideas, become more or less obsolete, and that then the true remedy lies, not in subverting the courts, but in altering the law by the normal legislative action of the society. The complaint seems directed to the wrong point; not the lay character of the Final Court, but the legislative paralysis of Convocation is at fault. It is not, of course, suggested that the Judicial Committee is satisfactory, either in theory or in practice. The notorious dissatisfaction which its decisions have provoked is not consistent with efficiency, but the point insisted on is the innocence of that predominantly lay character, which is often most vehemently denounced. Church history, justly considered, does not affirm that monopoly of doctrinal judgment which the clergy have commonly claimed. The State, as represented by a Constantine or a Charlemagne, did not refrain from legislating on faith and morals, and even a mediæval Parliament felt itself competent to decide on the pretensions of rival Popes. In some form or other the established tribunals of the State must control all property-holding corporations, and recent years have brought some remarkable examples of State interference with the doctrinal concerns of non-established denominations.

It should moreover be remembered that the conditions of the failure, if failure there has been, of the judicial system of the English Church have been so complex and difficult that it is hard to conceive any alternative system which would not have failed, if not in the same way, yet with no less mischievous consequences. "The careful study

of history suggests many problems for which it supplies no solution" is the dictum of the greatest living English historian,* and assuredly that is the case in the problem of our ecclesiastical tribunals. We can see the essential elements of the right solution, but how to combine them in any perfectly satisfactory scheme we do not see. A Final Court must be inaccessible to extra-judicial influences. That requirement demands the highest type of trained lawyer, and it seems impossible to satisfy it better than is done by the existing system. After all is said the fact remains that the highest legal qualifications in the world are found in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. A Final Court must command general confidence, and that suggests that it must be in its composition distinguished from the objects of popular suspicion. Under the circumstances of English society the Bishops, save under very exceptional conditions, must be, without fault of their own, nay, in consequence of their virtues as ecclesiastics and men, the objects of a large measure of popular suspicion. Therefore an appellant jurisdiction vested in the Episcopate seems to be prohibited not by any inherent principle of the national Establishment of the Church, but by the broad facts of the national life. Finally, the Supreme Court which is to interpret creeds, rubrics, and liturgies,—formularies which lose none of their sacred character and forfeit nothing of their spiritual obligation by incorporation in the Statutes of a Christian State—which must deal more or less directly with the affairs of the conscience, and stake out more or less decisively the boundaries of faith, must command the respect and enjoy the confidence of religious men. It is here that the lawyers and laymen seem to be inadequate. Is it too much to say that in this respect the Judicial Committee has been tried and found wanting? The suggestion is obvious, that, for the

* The Bishop of Oxford, *v.* STUBBS' *Const. Hist.*, iii. p. 296.

protection and reassurance of the sacred interests concerned in ecclesiastical appeals, the Bishops, as the constitutional representatives of the Christian Society, should hold an authoritative position in the Final Court. They may not be safely trusted with the interpretation of documents, for they are neither legally trained, nor by the habit of their lives likely to bring an unbiased mind to such tasks; but they must be assumed to be competent in a special degree to attest doctrine and adjudge heresy. More than this it seems presumptuous to claim: less it seems impossible to accept. Some form of compromise cannot be inaccessible to statesmanship. "It may be taken for granted," observes Bishop Stubbs,* "that between the extreme claims made by the advocates of [Church and State] there can never be even an approximate reconciliation." But history teaches nothing more plainly than this, that extreme claims never embrace the whole truth and always work mischief to the cause they seem to serve.

Perhaps the incident of Establishment which looms largest in the popular view is the royal appointment of the higher ecclesiastics, notably, of the whole Episcopate. Probably the State has acted on the Church more powerfully by this means than by any other engine of control involved in her legal status. It must be allowed that, on the surface, nothing in our ecclesiastical system seems more incompatible with the character of a spiritual society, and the traditions of a Christian Church. What is the method by which an English bishop reaches the throne of his diocese? It is strictly prescribed by the Statute of Henry VIII. passed in the year 1534 [25 Hen. VIII. cap. 20]. On the vacancy of any see, the sovereign may grant to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church

"a licence under the great seal, as of old time has been accustomed, to proceed to election of an archbishop or bishop

* *Const. Hist.*, vol. iii. p. 296.

of the see so being void, with a letter missive, containing the name of the person which they shall elect or choose: by virtue of which licence the said dean and chapter . . . shall with all speed and celerity in due form elect and choose the said person named in the said letters missive to the dignity and office of the archbishopric or bishopric so being void, and none other."

If the "election" be not made within twelve days of receiving the licence and letter missive, the king will appoint by letters patent without any ecclesiastical preliminaries. The like form is repeated for the consecration of the "elect" prelate. The sovereign directs his letters patent to certain archbishops and bishops requiring them "with all speed and celerity" to "invest and consecrate the person nominate." Failure to elect on the part of the Dean and Chapter, and to consecrate on the part of the prelates involves the guilty parties in "the dangers, pains, and penalties of the Statute of the Provision and Præmunire."

The consecrated bishop is required to take the following oath:—

"I —, Doctor of Divinity, now elected, confirmed, and consecrated Bishop of —, do hereby declare that your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of this your realm in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm: and I acknowledge that I hold the said Bishopric, as well the spiritualities* as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty. And for the same temporalities I do my homage presently to your Majesty. So help me God."

The Royal Supremacy acknowledged in these ample terms is, of course, that prescribed by the law and custom of the realm and no other. The language of the oath can add nothing to it, and, as has been pointed out, the law

* For the meaning of "spiritualities" see STUBBS' *Const. Hist.*, chap. xix, sec. 377, note 4.

has carefully excluded from it the notion of spiritual authority in the highest sense of the term. Regarding these arrangements as a whole, what can we say of them? It is evident that whatever rights the Church may possess are totally ignored, and that no effectual restraint on abusive action by the State is provided. It must be added that the history of the Church of England since the Reformation demonstrates the frequency and the facility with which the power of episcopal appointment has been abused. The courtier-bishops of the last century have become proverbial. Lord Palmerston's appointments are a byword. It is indeed the case that within the last generation a better practice has prevailed, but no thoughtful man can without disquietude reflect that the improvement has been almost wholly the work of a small knot of high-minded politicians, most of whom have already passed away, that there have been exceptions to the general rule, that there is no real security that the fragile tradition of honest appointments would withstand the necessities of a distressed government or the clamours of popular prejudice. Even if it were otherwise, can the retention of the solemn religious forms of election be justified when the reality of election has wholly disappeared? The late Lord Selborne maintained that

"those forms are not (as is often represented) a mere mockery, nor could they be abolished without the loss of some real security against improper appointments."

He thought that there was a reserve force of religious protest in the Chapters which might, if real occasion arose, be enabled to assert itself through the forms of election.

"Some instances have occurred of nominations unacceptable (whether for good or bad reasons) to parties within the Church. They have been few in number, but the remonstrances which they provoked were enough to show that a power of rejection in the

last resort is not, even as the law now stands, a thing without value ; while, on the other hand, the results of the same nominations go far to justify a state of the law which does not leave that power, uncontrolled and irresponsible, in the hands of bodies which might sometimes be too much influenced by temporary excitements and passing gusts of opinion.”*

Different minds will appraise differently the implied treatment of very solemn religious acts. To sensitive piety the singing of the “Veni Creator” at an English episcopal election is a very painful thing : but there is unquestionably real force in Lord Selborne’s contention, and it must be allowed that the whole history of clerical appointments, since the time of Constantine, has been wonderfully scandalous. It is not true that Anglican appointments have been worse than others : at present, thanks to the presiding influence of a vigilant public opinion and the personal action of religious statesmen, it is no extravagant contention that the quality of the English Bishops has no superior and hardly any equal in Christendom. So long as the practical difficulty does not reappear, it may be the course of a legitimate prudence to acquiesce in the anomalous methods which the twentieth century inherits from the coarse wisdom of the sixteenth.

VIII.

The course of politics throughout the nineteenth century has tended to destroy the recognised incidents and symbols of Establishment. The Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts [1828] abolished Warburton’s essential condition ; the admission of Roman Catholics to the franchise and to Parliament [1829] seriously compromised the ecclesiastical character of the State ; later Acts, by which in succession Quakers [1833], Jews [1858],

* *v. Defence of the Church*, p. 76.

and even atheists [1886] have been allowed to sit in Parliament, have gone still further in this direction. The legislation of the century has been uniformly directed to the destruction of ecclesiastical privilege and monopoly. The Education Act of 1870 ignored the traditional claim of the National Church, and opened the door to a bitter and continuous controversy, of which it is impossible to foresee any tolerable conclusion. The Abolition of Church Rates in 1868 was a formal repudiation of national duty, only defensible on the supposition that the National Church was henceforward to be treated precisely as a "religious denomination." Above all the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Irish Church proved the contempt with which the modern State regards the principles on which the historic connexion with the Church has been defended. The broad result of all this has been the evident disqualification of the State for the exercise of ecclesiastical functions. The process has synchronised with a remarkable development of self-importance in the Church of England. The religious awakening of the century, which has found expression in every part of the civilised world, has in England largely taken the form of an ecclesiastical revival. The quickened sense of social duty has allied itself with the renewed interest in Church History, and both have been stimulated by the evangelistic ardour of the non-established denominations.

The study of Church History had at first the effect of disgusting men with the Establishment; but the deeper study has the effect of reconciling them to a large tolerance of ecclesiastical anomalies. For it is seen that the verdict of the past is neither so clear nor so satisfactory as was at first supposed. Historic parallels are rarely so close or so helpful as could be wished. Church principles have not been so firmly held or so consistently

maintained as might have been expected. There has been operative in ecclesiastical history from the first an element of compromise, the "give-and-take" of real life which matches better with contemporary exigencies than with clerical theory. The distinctiveness of the Divine Society has in practice been found compatible with very large interferences on the part of the State. It is indeed true that the modern State has certain features which differentiate it sharply from the State of Christian History. The Civil Power embodied in and administered by the "Lord's anointed" could be accepted and justified on grounds which are not accessible to the modern apologist of Establishment. But the difference is less important than it looks. It cannot be seriously denied that the will of the modern State, constitutionally expressed through Parliament, is less likely to clash with the Divine Law than the personal determinations of such "nursing Fathers" of the Church as Henry VIII. or Charles II. It is not probable that while the State has gained greatly by the substitution of constitutional for personal monarchy, the Church has gained nothing. It is not the enlarged influence of Parliament, but its de-Christianised character that creates the difficulty of our time. The unequalled liberty of doctrine which prevails in the Church of England is no mean compensation for the partial paralysis of her legislative and judicial functions. Moreover, there are forces in the modern world which effectually prohibit that obscuration of the frontiers of Church and State, which in earlier times was easy and frequent. The whole weight of Nonconformity is cast in the scale against Erastianism, and if that danger really exists in the modern State it does so by virtue of a monstrous alliance between an obsolete legal theory and domestic fanaticism. The thoughtful Anglican will be vigilant against the facile mistake of attributing to the State-connexion difficulties

and abuses which really have their origin in the conditions of our time. Thus the decline of discipline, which, perhaps, is the most startling contrast between the Church of England and the Church of history, has its parallel in the Nonconformist bodies and in the Roman Church. The State needs not to lay arresting hand on the clergy; the easy tolerance of a sceptical age, and the multitude of competing denominations, suffice to rob spiritual censures of their proper effect. The theory of Anglican discipline might be improved by independence, but in practice the present laxity would still prevail. Ecclesiastical theory, however, is closely allied with religious sentiment, and while it ought ever to be firmly held to the probabilities of practice, ought never to be altogether ignored. Assuredly this century has witnessed a noteworthy development of ecclesiastical theory. The Church of England will no longer acquiesce in that position of tongue-tied submission which in the last century matched the political requirements of Sir Robert Walpole, and evoked the servile apologies of Bishop Warburton. She meets the growing neglect of the secularised State with an ever-waxing conviction of her own essential rights, and a bold assurance of her own competence to exercise them. Unfortunately her spiritual re-awakening has enormously increased her internal disunion. Her theory of right must be discounted by her practical paralysis. Thus the century closes on a very singular situation. On the one hand, a secularised State united by a historic bond with a Church, which on every occasion it sacrifices, and which it owns itself equally incompetent to control and unwilling to trust with self-control. On the other hand, a divided Church, full of energy, never richer in learning, zeal, and devotion, probably never more serviceable to the nation, and yet equally incompetent to control herself, and unwilling to be controlled.

The extraordinary difficulties of the situation suggest the need of coolness and patience. Establishment stands for much more than a review of its historic expressions or a statement of its surviving incidents may indicate. It includes a great national tradition, and it sustains a system which, however theoretically defective, is a working system. There is a consensus among our best parish priests as to the spiritual worth of that public status which the State-connexion secures to the parochial incumbent.*

Few thoughtful men would willingly withdraw from religion under present circumstances any weapon of influence it possesses. The removal of the vexatious incidents of Establishment, however destructive in the region of constitutional theory, has unquestionably increased the spiritual power of the established clergy. There has been gain as well as loss in the unfriendly action of the State. It is true that the principles on which Establishment has been justified in the past have now, almost without exception, lost validity. The case for Establishment must be argued on lower grounds. Does the historic connexion between Church and State any longer serve the highest interests of the nation? Are the admitted defects of that connexion really incapable of removal by some cautious process of revision and reform? Does it really involve any affront to the Christian conscience? Does it insult any genuine Church principle? Can it be fairly stigmatised as Erastian? Upon the

* Cf. Bishop THIRLWALL'S statement in 1848 [*Remains*, vol. i. p. 109]: "And whatever complaints may be heard among ourselves, and whatever reproaches may be cast against us by our adversaries, with regard to the imperfections of our ecclesiastical system, and the bondage, as it has sometimes been termed, of the Church, none can honestly allege that he meets with any impediments arising from this cause, which seriously limit the field of his usefulness, or restrain him from applying all his faculties to it, or preclude him from hoping for an abundant blessing on his work."

answers returned to such questions as these, the fate of Establishment must, in the judgment of the prudent Anglican, depend. It is easy to picture the present position of the Church of England as anomalous and even repulsive, but it is not so easy to indicate any practical improvement.* It is easy to denounce the surviving incidents of Establishment: it is not so easy to point out any effectual and superior alternatives. The system on which the Bishops are appointed may be theoretically indefensible, but it does not lack practical defence. Private patronage, which lives and dies with Establishment, is theoretically absurd, but it is found on the whole to work better than, or at least as well as the only known substitutes, episcopal appointment, or congregational choice, or a mixture of both. The Ecclesiastical Courts† have provoked much hostile criticism from many quarters, and their constitution is sufficiently anomalous, but though they loom large in the murky atmosphere of controversy, they do not affect any very numerous section of the clergy. Their reform is necessary, and ought not to be beyond the wisdom of statesmanship, but they do not seriously affect the general life of the Church. The average parish priest has no contact with the courts, and clerical criminals are neither influential nor numerous. The Convocations may be ridiculed as mere debating assemblies, but the causes of their practical impotence are more complex than the jealousy or ill-will of the State. It is no mean defence of the Establishment that its worst defects are theoretical, and its best excellences practical. When historic anomalies are found to work well, the

* Cf. Dean CHURCH (*Life and Letters*, p. 289): "We have inherited an anomalous state of things, in which the logical inconsistencies show the traces of our keen and repeated struggles, but, like other Englishmen, we put up with many anomalies which have come down to us."

† See also some very wise and pertinent observations to the same effect by Mr. WALTER BAGEHOT, *Literary Studies*, vol. ii. pp. 438-9.

prudent citizen will be slow to disturb them. Christendom itself, as we know it, is anomalous, and there is nothing to show that the anomalies of the English Establishment are in any special degree offensive. It is true, as we have shown, that the course of recent politics has tended to render the State incompetent for the exercise of those ecclesiastical functions which it has exercised in the past, and can legally exercise still. It must, however, be added that the modern State has largely lost its ecclesiastical interests, and has little desire to resume those ecclesiastical activities which once almost absorbed its attention. Parliamentary incompetence is thus mitigated by Parliamentary apathy, and, so long as this is the case, no intolerable results are likely to arise from the excessive powers which the State legally, if not constitutionally, possesses over the Church. It is not, however, hard to see that if this salutary indifference were to yield to any outburst of popular feeling, and a reversion to an active ecclesiastical policy should be induced, the time-worn connexion between Church and State would quickly come to an end. State action must henceforward lie in the direction of devolution. The evident necessities of Parliament coincide with the natural and legitimate aspirations of the Church in authorising a larger measure of ecclesiastical self-government than has hitherto been thought compatible with Establishment. Freedom of action must be permitted and enabled to a much greater extent than post-Reformation precedents permit, if the developed self-consciousness of the Church is to be in any degree reconciled, and the manifold demands of the Church's expanding work are to be in any measure satisfied. The impartial student of English affairs will, perhaps, be less doubtful of the goodwill of the State than of the competence of the Church. Internal division among Anglicans is easily explicable by the circumstances of

Anglican history, but it is none the less practically paralysing. It explains, if it does not, as indeed it cannot, justify, that irrational and unreasoning insistence on the largely obsolete details of the Restoration settlement, which marks moderate Anglicans of all schools of thought. Without loss of self-respect, men of diverse belief will defer to a time-honoured and national régime, which they can interpret and apply for themselves, but when once they are required to take in hand its revision, to bring it into conformity with actual convictions and evident needs, to qualify it for precise enforcement by authority, then they will manifest a more obstinate demeanour. The practical inconveniences of the situation are beyond all question very great. Lord Bacon's words are plainly more cogent to-day :—

“I would only ask why the civil State should be purged and restored by good and wholesome laws, made every third or fourth year in Parliament assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth mischief, and contrariwise the ecclesiastical estate should still continue on the dregs of time and receive no alteration now for these five-and-forty [two hundred and forty] years and more.” *

But though the practical inconveniences of the present situation are very great, they are not intolerable, nor need they seriously hamper the energy of zeal or the ardour of devotion. Good sense, a reasonable measure of self-suppression, and mutual forbearance can mitigate and neutralise them. It would seem the wisdom of the Church of England to endure much, and to acquiesce in more in order to escape the supreme calamity of domestic revolution. Time is on her side. In spite of recent events which seem to yield a different witness, the process of

* *Certain Considerations for the better Establishment of the Church of England*, p. 4. London, 1689.

unification is again advancing within her pale. It may be that another generation will be able to approach the problems involved in a revision of the Restoration Settlement with a larger measure of essential agreement than we at present possess. To that generation the task must be referred if its fulfilment is not to involve the nation in the folly of Disestablishment, and the Church in the disaster of Disruption.

III

Disendowment

BY C. A. WHITMORE, M.P.

THERE are some members of the Church of England who are in favour of its disestablishment, provided that it be not disendowed, and who in their simplicity believe that the Parliament which carried a measure of disestablishment might leave the Church in possession of its ancient endowments. The first object of this essay is to show that this belief is wholly illusory, and that, for practical reasons, disendowment is the necessary and inevitable corollary of disestablishment. Its second object is to indicate roughly what disendowment would probably signify and involve. Lastly, I shall press upon the honest advocates of disestablishment without disendowment the obvious loss to the Church and the nation which must be caused by any measure of disendowment, and shall beg of them to balance this loss against any supposed gain which in their judgment will accrue to the Church from its disestablishment.

From a parliamentary point of view the disestablishment of the Church of England is a task of vast magnitude and difficulty. Any Bill dealing with the question could only be carried through Parliament by the Government of the day. No so-called "Church of England party" within the House, and no groups of private members,

could ever succeed in steering such a Bill through all its stages. The Bill must, therefore, be introduced either by a Radical or a Conservative Ministry. I suppose, however, that everyone will agree that no Radical Ministry could ever propose to disestablish the Church, and to leave her endowments untouched. This task, then, must be undertaken by a Conservative Ministry. I cannot myself conceive the political situation and atmosphere which could induce a Conservative Government to adopt this policy. However the feeling within the Church in favour of disestablishment may grow, I cannot believe that under any circumstances it will ever seduce the whole body of earnest Churchmen. But in the Conservative ranks there are in every constituency hundreds of electors who regard this as a policy which involves political as well as purely religious considerations, and who, for quite worthy political reasons, will never willingly assent to disestablishment. Let, however, for the sake of argument, the to me inconceivable happen. Let a Conservative Government introduce a Bill for the disestablishment of the Church, leaving its endowments absolutely untouched. What would be the course and the fate of that measure in the House of Commons? The whole of the Radical party would dislike the policy of disestablishment without disendowment. If they did not take a formal vote against the second reading of the Bill, they would certainly strain every parliamentary device to impede its progress, to embarrass its authors, and to make the position of the disestablished Church irksome and unacceptable to the conscientious Churchmen who, on grounds wholly different from theirs, were anxious to liberate the Church from State control. At the same time there would be sitting on the ministerial benches a large number of typical and true Conservatives, who regarded the Bill with aversion, who would be bound by all their traditions, by all their

associations, and by their deliberate political convictions to offer to it an uncompromising and, in some cases, a passionate opposition. Anyone who knows anything of the House of Commons will perceive that under these conditions it would be astonishing if the Bill got through committee, and that it would be a parliamentary miracle if it emerged therefrom in a form that could be satisfactory, or even acceptable, to its Anglican promoters. Either the Government would have been compelled to promise to introduce some measure of disendowment in the near future, or some system of elective and popular control over the administration of the parochial and other endowments would have been engrafted on the original scheme. In either case the Church supporters of the Bill would be mortified, their ideals would receive a rude shock, and much of the motive power at the back of the Bill would disappear. The Bill would remain a revolutionary one; but its transformation in committee would have this result, that it would now fail to give satisfaction to any section of those who, with diverse hopes, had been anxious that the Church should be disestablished. The Government under such circumstances would find it hopeless to proceed with the Bill. And so I arrive at this conclusion. It is as vain to expect to see disestablishment without disendowment carried by a Conservative as by a Radical Government, and, if ever disestablishment come, it will come under the auspices of a Radical Government, during the period of a Radical Parliament, and it will come accompanied by disendowment. The political history of our own times confirms this conclusion. We have seen one successful attempt and two unsuccessful attempts by Governments to disestablish a Church, or a part of a Church. When the Church of Ireland was disestablished in 1868, its disestablishment was accompanied by a coincident disendowment. The abortive Bills of

1894 and 1895 for the disestablishment of the Church in Wales were also Bills for its simultaneous disendowment.

Those who as friends of the Church have committed themselves to disestablishment must clearly understand what disendowment is, what it means, and what its effects are likely to be. The disendowment of any Church means the appropriation by the State of funds which have been deliberately given for religious purposes, and their allocation by the State to some new, unintended, and necessarily secular uses. Whether the act of disendowment be carried out with tender consideration or with rigid rapacity, whether the revenue taken by the State be large or small, any disendowment of a Church must mean the diversion of property from the religious uses to which it was given, and which it was intended for all time to subserve, and its regrant for the benefit of certain secular objects which it was never intended to help, and which have been selected by the passing caprice, at a particular date, of the State. Religious Nonconformists and others have drifted into an easy habit of thinking lightly of this alienation of sacred endowments. Let us see how it has been regarded by some thoughtful and good men. In Book VII. of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Hooker deals with the contention of the opponents of the Church "that there ought not to be in the Church bishops endowed with such authority and honour as ours be," and considers the sources from which this "honour" springs. Amongst them he includes "honour by endowment with lands and livings." In chapter xxi. he discusses this source, and says :—

"And yet of all these things rehearsed it may be there never would have grown any question had Bishops been honoured only thus far. But the honouring of the clergy with wealth, this is, in the eyes of them which pretend to seek nothing but mere reformation of alms, a sin that might never be remitted.

"How soon, oh, how soon, might the Church be perfect, even without any spot or wrinkle, if public authority would at the length say Amen unto the holy and devout requests of these godly brethren, who as yet with outstretched necks groan in the pangs of their zeal to see the houses of Bishops rifled, and their so long desired livings gloriously divided amongst the righteous!"

But, he adds—

"If in Heaven there be a God, the sacrilegious intention of Church robbers, which lurketh under this plausible name of Reformation, is in His sight a thousand times more hateful than the plain professed malice of those very miscreants who threw their vomit in the open face of our blessed Saviour. . . . For the better information, therefore, of men which carry true, honest, and indifferent minds, these things we will endeavour to make most clearly manifest: First, that in goods and livings of the Church none hath propriety but God Himself. Secondly, that the honour which the clergy therein hath, is to be, as it were, God's receivers. Thirdly, that from Him they have right not only to receive, but also to use such goods, the lower-sort in smaller, and the higher in larger measure. Fourthly, that in case they be thought, yea, or found to abuse the same, yet may not such honour be lawfully taken from them and be given away unto persons of other calling. Possessions, lands, and livings spiritual, the wealth of the clergy, the goods of the Church, are in such sort the Lord's own that man can challenge no propriety in them."

It is interesting to recall an argument which Mr. Gladstone in his *Church and State* advanced against disendowment. It is not Hooker's, but it is based on purely religious considerations, and is altogether independent of those of political or social expediency which are commonly used on the one side or the other of this controversy.

In the third chapter of this book he wrote:—

"Establishment and Endowment are distinct: but what is generally and extensively endowed will for the most part come sooner or later to be established; and what is established is by

the very force of the term likewise endowed. And further, endowment does but ill harmonise with the very nature of dissent, because it introduces something of independence into the religious institution itself, and liberates it at least in part from the dominion of those successive wills which are too apt to revel in its absolute control.

"Now endowment, which is thus in its own nature akin to establishment, and alien to dissent, having a tendency to give to the minister of religion some degree of exemption from the arbitrary influence of his congregation, has also a commensurate tendency to preserve the purity of doctrine. Plato deemed it scandalous and at variance with the laws of virtue, to teach for a fee. St. Paul claimed that those who ministered in the gospel should live by their ministry: but the vital powers given to the Church enable her to admit many popular influences, which, if she dealt with mere abstractions and philosophy, and not with a living covenant of grace, she would be obliged zealously to exclude. And yet who does not see that the apostle himself in writing to his converts that he had laboured for his own support, because he would not be chargeable to any of them, affords an express recognition of that truth for which we here contend, namely, that when the Christian flock are placed habitually in the position of paymasters, notions of pride and self-sufficiency will infallibly associate themselves with that function, and men will claim the right to determine upon the doctrine, for whose inculcation they are continually reminded that they supply the pecuniary means?"

Professor Freeman, in his *Disestablishment and Disendowment*, asserts the right of the State to change by due process of law the ownership or use of any kind of property. "The State may," he says, "when it sees good reason for doing so, take or confiscate any property of any kind. From this rule property given to ecclesiastical purposes can claim no exemption." And he sums up the practical question thus: "It is simply a question whether a great and violent change, but a change which the Supreme Power has a perfect right to make, is or is not called for in the general interests of the country."

With some reservation Lord Selborne, in his *Defence of the Church of England*, assents to this as a statement of what may be termed constitutional law. But he emphasises "the greatness" and "the violence of the change," which is involved in any legal confiscation of Church property. His words are well worth quoting.

"It is not because the public revenue might be increased by bringing four or five millions a year from private property or from Church property into the receipt of the Exchequer, that it can be right to confiscate so much property, whether held by some particular individuals for their own sole benefit, or by the Church to which they belong for the maintenance of the ministry and services of their religion. To be justified on the ground of general interest or common good, such an act must have for its foundation some public necessity, or the prevention of some grave mischief, or some offence against the State, or other good cause of forfeiture on the part of those from whom the property is taken. Religion is the chief moral, and property is the chief material, bond of civilisation and of union among the members of a nation. To take away from (let us say) half or more than half the people property dedicated for centuries to the religious uses of the Church to which they belong—property which has continually received from the private gifts and expenditure of that Church renovation and augmentation upon an enormous scale, under the sanction and guarantee of law—would disturb at once, by a very 'great and violent change,' both those bonds of national union and concord. Such violence, unless justified on grounds such as I have mentioned, is unjust; it is a breach of public faith, and the infliction by superior force only, of loss and suffering upon those who have done nothing to deserve it. In proportion to the magnitude of the spoliation is the extent of the loss and suffering, the shock to public security, the disturbance of civil and social unity, which, if political ethics are at all to be regarded, cannot be for the general interest or the common good. If it is due to party warfare, political persecution, sectarian or social envy or jealousy, hostility of class to class, the very notion of just and equitable regard to the common good is, by such causes, excluded" (pp. 231 and 232).

These are grave and suggestive words. If we reflect upon them in conjunction with the opinions on endowment and disendowment of the three other eminent men which have been quoted above, I think we shall arrive at this conclusion. It is not necessary or wise that Churchmen should deny the legal right of the State, in the abstract, to disendow the Church, or that they should characterise this action as intrinsically sacrilegious. They may rely, I think, with safety on these propositions. Religious uses are the highest and best uses to which property can be devoted. The alienation by the State of property from religious to secular purposes will always, rightly or wrongly, produce in many minds a sense of injustice, different in kind from that produced when it makes a diversion of any secular endowments. There is not, therefore, merely a presumption against the alienation of religious endowments. The presumption is very strong—nay, of almost irresistible strength. To rebut this presumption, to justify the alienation, there must be overwhelming evidence that the endowments as applied at present are being abused, or fail to realise their true objects, and also that the proposed new application of them will really be more “for the general interest and the common good.” There should also be, to justify this action by the State, a general acceptance of the weight of this evidence, and a general concurrence of national sentiment and conviction in favour of “the great and violent change.”

I suspect there are a good number of people who would not seriously quarrel with this conclusion, or who might, in the abstract, be inclined even to give to it a general assent, who yet fancy that there are some special qualities and conditions appertaining to some of the endowments of the Church of England, which distinguish them from other religious endowments. They fancy that there is

something in the original source, in the legal descent, and the history of some of these endowments, which makes them exceptional, and justifies an exceptional treatment of them by the State. Let us consider how far these fancies are founded on actual facts.

Many good people, who would be shocked if it was proposed to dispossess by Act of Parliament any one of the Nonconformist bodies of the endowments which it may enjoy, and who, perhaps, would be unwilling forcibly to alienate an endowment of the Church which, to their own knowledge, had been given to her by particular individuals at the present day, yet regard the suggested diversion of her more ancient endowments with positive pleasure or complacent indifference. They distinguish between the more ancient and the more modern property of the Church. They have a vague impression that the former may be looked upon as "national property," which was transferred in old days by the State to the Church by some one deliberate act, or at all events by some few systematic and notable donations. And they argue that the State has consequently a different and a freer kind of right to deal with this property than with endowments which have accrued to the Church in other ways. Professor Freeman has discussed the soundness of this argument in *Disestablishment and Disendowment*, a pamphlet originally published in 1875, and republished in 1885. In it he was not writing as an advocate of the policy of disendowment, or as a Church defender. His object was to banish confusions of thought, to expose historical fallacies, and to make clear the real meaning of the principal terms employed in this controversy. His conclusions, therefore, have a peculiar force, and it is worth while to quote them at some length.

"Church property," he says, "is not 'national property,' except in the same sense in which all property is national property. It

is not 'national property' in the only strict sense of these words. It is not folkland, *ager publicus*, property of which the nation is not only sovereign, but landlord. It ceased to be so whenever it passed into the hands of those who founded the ecclesiastical corporations. For here comes in another confusion. People talk as if 'Church property' was the property of one vast corporation called 'the Church.' In truth it is simply the property of the several local churches, the ecclesiastical corporations, sole and aggregate, bishops, chapters, rectors, and vicars, or any other. The Church of England, as a single body, has no property."

And he proceeds:—

"We must fully take in the fact that Church property is not the property of one vast body, but of various local bodies scattered up and down the country. These local bodies, forming corporations, sole or aggregate, hold estates which had been acquired at sundry times and in divers manners from the first teaching of Christianity to the English till now. They are held by all manner of tenures, from the oldest to the newest. One ecclesiastical person or body may hold a piece of land granted by King Æthelberht; another may have a stipend from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, which was paid for the first time last quarter-day.

"In short, we must put out of sight the popular notion that, at some time or other, the State determined to make a general national endowment of religion. And we must also put out of sight the other popular notion, that at some time or other, the State took certain funds from one religious body and gave them to another. Neither of these things ever happened. If ever there was a time when the State determined on a general national establishment of religion, we must suppose it to have been at the time of the conversion of the English nation to Christianity. But the conversion of England took place gradually, when there was no such thing as an English nation capable of a national act. The land was still cut up into small kingdoms, and Kent had been Christian for some generations at a time when Sussex still remained heathen. If any act which could be called a systematic establishment and endowment of the Church ever took place anywhere, it certainly took place in each particular kingdom for itself, and not in England as a whole.

“But it would be an abuse of language to apply such words as systematic establishment and endowment to the irregular process by which the ecclesiastical corporations received their possessions. The process began in the earlier times, and it has gone on ever since. And nothing was done systematically at any time. The nearest approach to a regular general endowment is the tithe, and this is not a very near approach. The tithe can hardly be said to have been granted by the State. The state of the case rather is that the Church preached the payment of tithe as a duty, and that the State gradually came to enforce the duty by legal sanctions.

“In short, the ecclesiastical endowments of England have grown up, like everything else in England, bit by bit. A number of ecclesiastical corporations have been endowed at all manner of times and in all manner of ways; but there was no one particular moment when the State of England determined to endow one general religious body called the Church of England.”

A somewhat similar illusion to the last is that which assumes that the bulk of the Church's endowments were taken by the State at some one time from one religion and bestowed upon another. Without doubt this assumption strengthens the case for disendowment with many minds. Professor Freeman deals with this idea as follows:—

“And if there was no one particular moment when, as many people fancy, the State endowed the Church by a deliberate act, still less was there any moment when the State, as many people fancy, took the Church property from one religious body and gave it to another.”

Then he declares that he has nothing to do with any theological argument as to what exactly the Reformation in England involved, and proceeds:—

“Our position is a much humbler one. It is simply that, whether the religious body did or did not so change theologically (at that time) as no longer to be the same, yet as a matter of law and history, as a matter of plain fact, there was no taking

from one religious body and giving to another. We must remember that there was not in England, as some people seem to think, and as there really was in some foreign countries, some one act done at a definite time called the 'Reformation.' Under the name of the Reformation we jumble together a great number of changes spread over many years. In popular language the Reformation sometimes means the throwing off of the authority of the Pope, sometimes the suppression of the monasteries, sometimes the actual religious changes, the putting forth of the English Prayer-book, and the Articles of Religion. Here are three sets of changes, all of which are undoubtedly connected as results of a general spirit of change; but as a matter of fact they were done by different people at different times.

"The final result might be that theological continuity was broken, but no act was done by which legal and historical continuity was broken.

"In the sixteenth century, as at several other times before and since, laws were made to which the holders of ecclesiastical benefices had to conform under pain of losing those benefices. As a matter of fact, the great mass of their holders did conform through all changes. There was much less than people commonly think even of taking from one person and giving to another; and the general taking from one religious body and giving to another, which many people fancy took place under Henry the Eighth or Elizabeth, simply never happened at all.

"We are not wishing in any way to undervalue the greatness either of the direct theological change, or of the indirect changes of all kinds which followed on the long series of events known as the English Reformation.

"We are dealing with a dry matter of fact and of law. There was no one particular moment, called the Reformation, at which the State of England determined to take property from one Church or set of people and to give it to another. As there was no systematic endowment in the sixth or seventh century, still less was there any systematic disendowment and re-endowment in the sixteenth."

Tithe forms so important a part of the endowments of the Church that any quality that it has which is

supposed to distinguish it from other forms of the Church's property, and to justify its alienation, must here be noticed. With reference to tithe, then, this allegation crops up over and over again in the literature of the Liberation Society. It is declared that at some mythical period a fixed portion of the tithe was allocated directly to the poor of the parish. In a tract entitled *Tithes and the Poor* it is stated (1) that "in all the early laws about tithes it is clearly laid down that the poor were to have a share of the tithes, and as good a share as the clergy," (2) that "at first" the division into four parts, and "after a while" into three parts—one for the poor—prevailed in England; (3) that "later on, when the tithes were not offered freely enough to satisfy the priests," and "a law was therefore passed to compel people to give them, the same plan was insisted upon, and the poor still had their share"; (4) that "this was before the time of Parliaments; but when Parliament made laws upon the subject, the right of the poor to their share was preserved"; and the conclusion is, "It is quite clear, then, that the poor were meant to have a share of the tithe; and when they come into the hands of the nation the poor will be right in claiming that the tithes shall be employed in part for their benefit. But the clergy have the tithes now; and so long as the Church remains Established they will keep them. The first step, therefore, towards getting back the tithes for the benefit of the poor, is disestablishment and disendowment." Lord Selborne elaborately shows that there is no valid historical evidence to support this conclusion (*A Defence of the Church*, pp. 146-159), and after quoting a letter in which Bishop Stubbs writes, "the claim of the poor on the tithe was a part of the claim of the Church; and although this claim was never made the subject of an apportionment, tripartite or quadripartite, except in unauthoritative or tentative recommendations,

it has never been ignored or disregarded by the Church or clergy," he adds, "the end and object of the parochial system, and of all its endowments, is that there may be in every parish a resident clergyman, with such suitable provision for his maintenance as may enable him to do as much good as possible, in all sorts of ways, among his people, and especially to the poor: the permanent beneficiaries, for whose sake the system and the endowments exist, are the general body of Churchmen in every parish, and especially the poor. It is not by a legal partition of tithes, or of other fruits of a benefice, that this object could be accomplished."

Another argument is not infrequently used in support of the disendowment of the Church of England, or at all events in extenuation of its probable effects, which I do not think is ever employed by Nonconformists in favour of a general diversion to secular uses of all religious property. For some mysterious reason it is assumed that, in the case of the Church of England, vested and permanent property exercises a benumbing and sterilising influence, which it does not have in the case of other denominations. This argument deserves some attention. It is implied that, in the case of the Church, endowments check the flow of voluntary benefactions, and that, therefore, the Church, if and when disendowed, would gain as much from new private liberality as she had lost by the alienation of her ancient wealth. One wonders whether the smug repeaters of this argument believe in its reality. There is, of course, a certain superficial plausibility about it. No doubt the members of the disendowed Church of England would seek with lavish hands to repair the losses she had sustained through disendowment. But what practical man would ever give effect to this reasoning in the case of any other institution to which he was attached, and in whose effective working

he was interested? Would those who are responsible for the administration of the affairs of a university or a college ever think of relinquishing its property in order that they might be justified in asking its *alumni* to support it by their gifts? What managers of a London hospital would abandon its fixed income so that they might be able to make a more pitiful appeal to the millionaires of the Metropolis? Would the heads of any of the Nonconformist bodies, which are in possession of vested endowments, ever dream of sacrificing them in order that their coffers might be more than replenished by a gracious rain of new voluntary subscriptions? Apart from this, is it the fact, or anything like the fact, that the endowments of the Church of England discourage and deter her members from supplying adequate voluntary assistance to her in all her manifold spheres of work? No one who has given any attention to the present activity of the Church can hesitate to answer this question in the negative. In truth, while the endowments of the Church give a stability and an assured solvency to certain branches of her work, they enable the munificence of Churchmen to flow through divers channels to all sorts of other objects which she is now striving to attain. It is still, however, sometimes asserted that Church people are less generous in the support of their Church than are the members of the voluntary Churches. This assertion obtained a fresh currency during the debates last Session on the Clerical Tithes Bill. The political opponents of that measure delighted to stigmatise it as a proof that the clergy of the wealthiest Church in the country were obliged to come begging to Parliament for the pecuniary relief which the warm-hearted laity of the poor Nonconformist bodies would readily have found out of their own pockets for their ministers. In fact, this Act was, it need hardly be said, not a measure of largesse on the

part of the State to the clergy, but the tardy redress by it of an exceptional and positive injustice in the incidence of taxation upon the particular class of clergy of the Church of England, which if it had happened to have fallen on any other body of ministers of religion would have been rectified long ago. However, this alleged new sign of the niggardliness of the members of the endowed Church was reiterated with so much malignant glee that it is necessary to show by actual facts how baseless this charge is, and to make the many-sided and copious generosity of Church people incontestably patent even to the most carping of the Church's critics.

There is a careful and interesting article on "The Church's Endowments in 1830 and 1880" in the April number of the *Quarterly Review*, 1881, which gives an elaborate account of the growth in her resources between those two dates. For the specific statistics of its more recent development, and of the munificence of its members, I am indebted to the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England* for 1899. Let us take first the matter of church building. A House of Lords Return, moved for by Lord Hampton in 1874, purported to give all sums expended in restoring or building cathedrals or churches since 1840, provided that at least £500 had been expended on the building for which the return was made. This return, with a supplementary one moved for in 1876, shows that £25,548,703 had been expended in this period upon building 1,727 and restoring 7,144 churches. The *Quarterly Review* points out how even this "large sum must fall far below the facts." With regard to clerical incomes, this article shows that "during the fifty years which have intervened between 1830 and 1880, the annual value of the incomes of the clergy has risen from £3,251,139 to £4,547,244, or nearly 40 per cent., and

that notwithstanding the large addition of 3,077 in the number of benefices returned." It also proves that the bulk of this rise is due to voluntary benefactions, and not to any automatic endowment in the value of the Church's property. And now to turn to more recent years.

In church building, according to the *Church Year-Book*, voluntary subscriptions were devoted to the building, enlargement, and restoration of churches, endowment of districts, erection of parsonage houses and schools in the following large towns between the years 1867 and 1885 as follows:—

	£		£
Barrow-in-Furness .	50,000	Sheffield . .	303,957
Bolton	290,000	Northampton .	113,678
Rochdale . . .	93,070	Preston . . .	156,300
Leicester . . .	252,790	Hastings . . .	151,567
Nottingham . .	233,466	Plymouth . . .	89,531
Bristol	505,351	Hull	207,335
Manchester . .	859,737	Derby	141,643
Leeds	358,278	Swansea . . .	49,606
Halifax	275,117	Birmingham .	304,557

For the period between 1884 and 1897, the following sums were devoted to the following objects:—

	£
Church building	15,188,784
Endowments	1,893,174
Burial grounds	457,614
Parsonage houses	1,337,523

£18,877,095

From January to December, 1897, voluntary offerings to the following objects were thus given :—

	£
Church building and restoration .	1,166,004
Burial grounds.	34,353
Endowment of benefices . . .	148,471
Parsonage houses	87,830

Between the years 1875 and 1885, £643,291 was given for the restoration of cathedrals.

The same book states that between 1811 and 1897 the Church has expended on schools and training colleges no less a sum than £40,792,268,

Summing up the voluntary offerings of the Church of England for diocesan Church purposes of all kinds, it shows in detail that for the year ending at Easter, 1898, they amounted in the case of central and diocesan societies and institutions to £2,206,976, and, in the case of funds locally raised, and administered by the clergy for parochial purposes, to £5,299,354, making a total of £7,506,330.

It is unnecessary to supplement these figures at any length by many others to show the general liberality of Churchmen to good objects outside the strict limits of purely Church work. But this further statistic may be given. Hospital Sunday collections for the years 1878–98 stood thus :—

	£
Contributions of Churchmen in 89,782 separate collections	1,268,492
Contributions of other bodies in 58,699 separate collections	509,582

I think the facts here recorded entirely refute the allegation that the safe possession of the fixed endowments of the Church has hardened the hearts of her members and closed their pockets. Churchmen do not, therefore, require the bracing stimulus of disendowment to make them properly liberal either to her, or to good works outside her pale.

So far as I know, I have now reviewed all the arguments which are supposed to differentiate the ancient endowments of the Church from the endowments of other denominations, and have proved that not one of these arguments justifies a different treatment of them by Parliament from that which it would mete out to the property of any Nonconformist Church.

Anyone, therefore, who attaches a grave significance to wealth deliberately dedicated to religious uses, anyone who would be startled by the proposal that the State should divert the distinct endowments of the Baptist Church to the future benefits of London hospitals, must logically approach the proposal to treat the funds of the Church of England in this fashion with honest and deep reluctance. He must be convinced that there is, as we have said, an almost invincible presumption against alienations of this sort.

Now let us see what legislative disendowment actually signifies. We have the example of the Irish Church Act and of the two Welsh Disestablishment Bills to refer to. The Irish Church Disestablishment Act of 1869 was, throughout the discussions upon the policy involved in it, defended by Mr. Gladstone as exceptional legislation required by Irish conditions and needs, and in no way to be taken as a precedent for similar measures in Great Britain. And certainly the disendowment portions of the Act were far more tender to the Irish Church's incumbents and more considerate of her future interests, than could be

the corresponding proposals in any Bill for the disendowment of the English Church that might now be introduced. As originally explained by Mr. Gladstone, the endowments of the Church to be alienated amounted to about £16,000,000. No less than £8,650,000 would be devoted to compensation for vested interests, and this sum received some accretions during the passage of the Bill through Parliament. At first it was provided that all private endowments made after 1669 should be reserved to the Church. Earlier dates were suggested by the opponents of the Bill, and eventually the Government consented to make a payment of £500,000 in substitution for all private benefactions. The control of cathedrals and churches was left in the hands of the new Church Governing Body to be created by the Church itself. These, according to modern Liberationist ideas, were terms of profligate extravagance and of excessive kindness to the disestablished Church. Still, with disendowment applied in this comparatively gentle fashion, there remains the central and crucial fact that some £7,000,000 of money which had been applied to distinctly religious uses, and which had been deliberately intended to be so applied, was taken away from them and thenceforth allowed to secular objects. What are these objects? In the words of the preamble of the Bill this surplus of the Church's revenues was to be devoted to the relief of "unavoidable calamities and suffering," not provided for by the Poor Law, and stated to be such objects as "lunatic asylums; idiot asylums; training schools for the deaf, dumb, and blind; the training of nurses; reformatories; and county infirmaries." It is interesting to compare this list of the appropriate objects to which sacred funds should be diverted with that which was put forward under the schemes of the two Welsh Disestablishment and Disendowment Bills.

The first of the Welsh Bills was introduced in the Session of 1894. It was read a first time in the House of Commons, but made no further progress, and was withdrawn before the end of the Session. The second, which was substantially the same measure, was read a second time in the House of Commons in 1895, and had made some progress in the committee stage, when Lord Rosebery's Government was defeated and resigned. It will be remembered that Mr. Gladstone was still Prime Minister when the Session of 1894 began. He retired from office in March of that year, but remained M.P. until the end of that Parliament in June, 1895. The disendowment provisions of these two Bills may be thus summarised. The existing interests of the bishops, incumbents, and other holders of freehold offices would be charged on exclusively Welsh Church property. When they fell in, the whole of this property would be apportioned to Welsh purposes, and would pass from the Church to the community. A Board of three Commissioners, appointed by Parliament, would be constituted to administer the bulk of the Church property. At the appointed day all Welsh Church assets in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners would vest in this Commission. A Church representative body was to be appointed by the action of the members of the disestablished Church. All churches, except the cathedrals, would, on the application of the Church body, vest in that body. The cathedrals would be treated as national monuments vested in, and to be maintained by the Commission, which, at the request of the Church body, would permit them to be used for divine service. Parsonage houses would vest in the Church body, to which would be assigned all private benefactions made since 1703. In rural districts burial grounds would vest in the parish councils; in urban parishes, in the town and district councils. After meeting compensation and other charges,

the available surplus funds, in the hands of the Commission, would be liberated for secular objects, and in the words of the First Schedule of the Bill of 1895 they might be employed as follows: in "the erection or support of cottage or other hospitals, or dispensaries and convalescent homes; the provision of trained nurses for the sick poor; the foundation and maintenance of public, parish, or district halls, institutes, and libraries; the provision of labourers' dwellings and allotments; technical and higher education, including the establishment and maintenance of libraries and museums, and galleries of art, of local and general utility, for which provision is not made by statute." In the case of the parochial portion of the funds, the property would be applied under schemes to be made by the county councils, and approved by the Commission, the interests of the particular parish being primarily considered; while the administration of the central funds, derived from episcopal and capitular revenues, would remain absolutely in the hands of the Commission.

It will be noted how different are the secular objects which might have benefited under Welsh disendowment from those which were the beneficiaries under the Irish Act. In truth, a wholly unsentimental, but very real objection to the diversion of property from religious to secular uses is the shifting importance and popularity of secular institutions.

One philanthropic fad succeeds another in fashion, and pushes its predecessor into obscurity and neglect. Mechanics' institutes, parish rooms, open spaces, polytechnics, working-class dwellings, old age pensions, appeal in turn to popular sentiment, and find themselves aided by positive legislation. When some of the parochial charities of the City of London were dealt with by Parliament in 1883, it chanced that polytechnics and open spaces were the favourite objects of benevolent Londoners,

and so the City of London Parochial Charities Act enacted that the body which was created to administer the transferred funds, should apply them primarily for the promotion and maintenance of these objects.

The London polytechnics are doing admirable work, and the assistance which they have received from the funds placed at the disposal of the Board which administers this Act has been of high value. But if legislation with respect to these charities had been deferred to the present day, it is not probable that Parliament would have selected this particular object, and dedicated their revenues especially to the working of polytechnics. This is not the special phase of metropolitan philanthropy which now holds the field. Just now I think that there would be an irresistible demand in London that liberated revenues of this sort should be devoted in some way or other to the housing of the working classes. In the country districts, were Church endowments to be at the disposal of Parliament, a considerable section of politicians would proclaim from every platform that they should be used in aid of some unformulated system of State pensions for the aged.

In considering the way in which disendowment was applied by the Irish Church Disestablishment Act, and the way in which it was proposed to be applied by the two Welsh Church Disestablishment Bills, a fact of material importance, which has already been referred to, must be borne in mind. It was Mr. Gladstone who was the author of the former Act, who conducted the Bill through the House of Commons, and who was all-powerful in the Parliament of that day. And though he retired in March, 1894, before the actual introduction of the Welsh Church Disestablishment Bill that year, he was still Prime Minister when the Queen's Speech, which included that Bill in its legislative programme, was composed, and must

have had a powerful voice in the drafting of the Bill. The disendowment proposals of the similar Bill of 1895 were naturally on the same general lines and of the same nature.

But if a Bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England be introduced by a Radical Government at some future time, there will be no influence such as Mr. Gladstone's to mitigate the effects of disendowment upon the subsequent work of the Church, or on the fortunes of its incumbents. We must go back to 1885 to recollect the real hopes which inspire Radicalism, and the true motives by which it is actuated, when it seriously proposes to disestablish and disendow the Church. In that year was fought the first General Election in the new single-membered constituencies, after the extension of the franchise in the counties. This was the opportunity for the so-called "unauthorised programme" of the advanced Radicals. This placed the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in the front of necessary legislative reforms. The principles on which it was desired to see disendowment carried out were elaborated in *The Case for Disestablishment*, and *The Radical Programme*, which were largely circulated at that time. In both these publications the disendowment provisions of the Irish Act are referred to as examples of what should not be done in the case of the English Church. According to *The Case for Disestablishment* (pp. 167, 168), "those provisions have brought the Irish Church Act into disrepute, and have created in many minds the feeling that it would be better not to disestablish the Church of England at all, than to do so on the terms of the Irish Act. . . . The mischief done in Ireland may be small, but it is felt that it would not be so in England, where the property held by the Church is so vast, and its re-endowment on a large scale—in the guise of compensation to the members

of the disestablished Church—would prove a source of serious and lasting evil." While *The Radical Programme* (p. 156) observes, "If disestablishment were to be conducted on the same rules of equity and liberality as were adopted in the case of the Irish Church, Mr. Gladstone has made out (16th May, 1873) that 'between life incomes, private endowments, and the value of fabrics and advowsons, something like £90,000,000 sterling would have to be given, in the process of disestablishment, to the ministers, members, and patrons of the Church of England.' This would indeed be a sovereign triumph of injustice, and a political catastrophe of unmeasured magnitude." They, therefore, contend for the adoption of different principles. They lay down that "both ancient and modern buildings, as well as all endowments, now appropriated to the use of the national Church, must be regarded as national property, at the disposal of the State" (*Radical Programme*, p. 178). Again, the property of the Church "is the property of the nation as a whole; and the State is perfectly within its rights, if the Legislature shall think fit, in diverting every shilling of Church property to secular uses, from the lands with which Edward the Confessor endowed the Abbey of St. Peter's, Westminster, down to the last sovereign subscribed to build a church in a destitute district" (*Radical Programme*, p. 162). Let us state what are the positive proposals by which they would give effect to these principles.

1. All "the cathedrals, abbeys, and other monumental buildings should be under national control, and be maintained for such uses as Parliament may from time to time determine."

2. All churches "existing at the time of the passing of the first of the Church Building Acts, 1818," including all such of them as have since that time been rebuilt or restored with the moneys of Churchmen, are to be taken

away from the Church altogether and "vested in a parochial board, to be elected by the ratepayers, which board should have power to deal with them for the general benefit of the parishioners in such ways as it may determine."

3. Churches built after 1818, at the sole expense of any donor "living at the date of disestablishment," may, on his application, be vested in him, or in such persons as he may appoint. But if the sole donor be dead such churches would apparently be transferred to and vested in the parochial boards.

4. Churches built after 1818 exclusively by means of voluntary subscriptions, and also such as might be, but are not, claimed by a sole donor still living, are to "become the property of the existing congregation, and to be held in trust for their use," if accepted on their behalf within a certain time. If not so accepted they are to vest in the parochial boards.

5. Churches built since 1818, partly by voluntary subscriptions, and partly from parliamentary grants and "other public sources," are to be "in like manner offered to the congregations," charged, however, with the repayment to the State of "the amount so derived from public sources."

6. Existing incumbents are to be allowed, "on payment of rent, according to the valuation adopted in settling their claims for compensation," to retain during their lives the use and occupation of their residence-houses.

7. All endowments of earlier date than 1818 are to be confiscated. Those of later date are to be dealt with in the same manner as the churches.

In my judgment the disendowment proposals which will accompany any Bill that may in the future be introduced by a Radical Ministry will resemble this scheme rather than the gentler methods of Irish disestablishment.

But whatever may be the composition and temper of the Parliament by which the Church is disendowed, and whatever may be the precise form which disendowment may take, there are certain portions of her property which must be absolutely taken from her whenever an Act of disestablishment and disendowment be passed. A distinct and irrecoverable subtraction from her present income must then be made. It is necessary to insist upon this, because some people seem to have a loose impression that disendowment will in some rough-and-ready way redistribute and readjust that income. They appear to look upon it rather as a measure for the equitable redistribution of the Church's revenues than one which will irrevocably deprive her of some portions of them. Of course, there is in fact no connection whatever between disendowment and a redistribution of Church endowments. Starting from the assumption that the higher dignitaries of the Church are too highly paid, and its poorest and most hardworking clergy inadequately rewarded, these reformers of the Church seem to imagine that either as a direct sequel to, or as an indirect consequence of, disendowment there will come a greater equality in clerical incomes, and a general, equitable, and practical readjustment of her resources to present needs. Nothing of the kind will happen. In truth the assumption is becoming year by year less true. Through existing agencies the old discrepancy between the maximum and minimum of clerical incomes is steadily diminishing. At the same time a fairer measure and proportion is being gradually established between the work done and the stipend received. More, doubtless, remains to be done. But this can be, and will be done quite apart from and independently of disendowment. The Church's resources are now being constantly readjusted to meet her present practical needs. And, far from disendowment assisting or

hastening this process, it would operate in precisely the opposite direction. It would at once create new fiscal difficulties and anomalies. It would inflict a blow upon the Church where she is pecuniarily weakest. It would hardly touch her where money comes flowing to her aid. Lord Selborne, in his *Defence of the Church of England*, gives an elaborate account of the several sources of the Church's revenues, and estimates the probable loss in income that disendowment would produce.

I would venture to recommend all students of this question to read this book, and for myself, who have already quoted so freely from it, and who am about again to draw somewhat at length from its pages, I can but express my indebtedness to it for much information and thought which have become embodied in this essay. Taking the case of the parochial clergy, that book shows how the incomes of the parochial clergy are derived (1) from tithe rent-charge, (2) from glebe-lands, (3) from augmentations by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty, and (4) from modern private benefactions. It is clear that the first three of these four sources of income must be dealt with by any act of disendowment. But these are precisely the endowments which most sustain the poorest clergy in the agricultural country districts, and which are of least material importance in all the districts, rural and urban alike, where there is a large and well-to-do resident population. Let a few examples of this fact be given. Cambridgeshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, Wiltshire, are agricultural counties which have felt the pinch of bad times. If disendowment was applied to their ecclesiastical benefices, Cambridgeshire would lose £22,055 from ancient land endowments, and £49,698 from tithe rent-charge. Suffolk would lose £19,308 and £156,696, Norfolk £28,872 and £205,602, and Wiltshire £17,849 and £79,915 from these same sources; while Middlesex with its overflowing popula-

tion and superabundant wealth would only be deprived of £10,833 and £50,783, Surrey of £5,357 and £50,481, and Stafford, with all its mineral and manufacturing resources, and its great industrial communities, of £13,825 and £38,089. Similar eloquent contrasts of the effects of disendowment on the parochial system in different parts of England might be indefinitely multiplied. Taking the whole organisation of the Church as an integral unit, the same sort of result would be arrived at. Disendowment on the mildest terms and most considerate principles would necessarily fall heaviest on those portions of the Church's activity and beneficence which stood most in need of the stable and permanent sustenance afforded by ancient endowments, and would least affect her work where she could best afford to lose these sources of income. I will not myself affect to put forward any figures purporting to indicate what would be the probable loss in income to the Church as a whole from any possible act of disendowment. The value of her assets varies so greatly at different times. It is so difficult to obtain really accurate and complete returns. But it is permissible to quote what Lord Selborne thought would be the pecuniary effect of disendowment.

"What," he asks, "would happen if the members of the Church of England were in this wholesale way deprived of the means already provided by the munificence and piety of the present and former generations of Churchmen for the maintenance of their ministry throughout the land? What was taken away would be in round numbers (if we accept the figures of the *Clergy List*) £4,800,000 a year, without reckoning parsonage houses or churches. The parochial system would either be still maintained, or it would not. It could not be properly maintained at a much less average cost than £300 a year (which would be subject to rates, taxes, and curates' stipends) for each of the 13,739 parishes. This would come to a total cost of £4,121,700 a year. If parsonage houses were taken away, that

want also must be supplied : if churches, that also. Unless the work were to suffer, those Churchmen of the living generation who might have the will and the means, must find out of their own pockets that sum of £4,121,700, or something very like it, besides parsonages and churches, if taken away, and so much more as might be necessary to maintain upon a proper footing the episcopal government and diocesan organisation of their Church. In other words, the practical effect (I must suppose the design, for reason as well as law presumes men to mean the necessary or natural consequences of their actions),—the practical effect of a general disendowment of the Church would be to inflict a fine or penalty of considerably more than £4,000,000 a year upon the members of the Church of England, who are certainly as loyal subjects and useful citizens as any of those who seek to do them this wrong. Can it be supposed that a burden of that kind, and of that magnitude, could be thrown upon the Churchmen of one generation, who might be willing to make the needful sacrifices, without crippling their means of doing good, and of meeting the public, charitable, social, and private demands upon them, in a multitude of ways ; or that it could be endured by them without an acute and lasting sense of oppression and injury ?

“The other alternative is, that the want would not be adequately supplied ; that for a considerable time at all events, huge gaps and breaches would be made in the parochial system of the Church of England. And this, it may most reasonably be thought, is the probable alternative. Mr. Gladstone has, indeed, expressed ‘a strong conviction that if this great modification of our inherited institutions shall hereafter be accomplished, the vitality of the Church of England will be found equal to all the needs of the occasion.’ This is a very high tribute to the Church. But the adjustments and the sacrifices which so violent a revolution—likely enough to bring other revolutionary changes in its train—must render necessary, could hardly be made over the whole kingdom all at once ; and the pressure of the times in which we live upon most men’s resources is even now severe. In this alternative, both the richer and the poorer Churchmen would, in varying degrees, be sufferers : the richer, in so far as they might actually bear the burden, and contribute to supply the want ; the poorer, from any share of it which might fall

upon themselves, as a similar burden now falls upon the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland; and still more from the deprivation or diminution of the benefits of a settled ministry, in those places where they might for the time be altogether lost, or materially reduced, which would usually be the poorest places, where there might be nothing else to make up for the loss."

There are three points in this quotation which may be amplified and emphasised. Assume that the devotion and generosity of Churchmen will supply the necessary £4,121,000 a year for the Church's needs. Will they, however, find that huge sum, and yet continue to give as before to all the multifarious "charitable, social, and private demands" upon them? After all, the private wealth of the country is not illimitable. There are proper and necessary circumscriptions to the generosity of the most public-spirited men. The war in South Africa is supplying us with some useful evidence on this point. The subscriptions to the many funds connected with this war are magnificent in amount. But it is notorious that they are not a purely additional drain upon the pockets of their generous donors. In very many instances they are in substitution for other payments to other objects which are, at all events temporarily, foregone and sacrificed. To a very large extent they are depleting the present subscription lists of hundreds of good charities and institutions and societies of all kinds. And so it would inevitably be, were Churchmen to be called upon after disendowment to produce this vast new income for the Church in addition to the £7,500,000 a year, which they are now subscribing.

The second point is this. Lord Selborne remarks, "the pressure of the times in which we live upon most men's resources is even now severe." Yes, but this was written in 1886. And since then many causes have contributed to make this pressure even more severe upon all but the

very rich, and the wage-earning classes. The continuous growth in the functions assigned to and expected of local administration, urban and even rural, has produced a corresponding increase in the burden of local taxation. The course of the war in South Africa must inevitably lead to a great expenditure, which will be met mainly by these same already heavily taxed classes. But this will not be the only fiscal result of this war. It is already obvious that our prepared and organised imperial strength has not marched with the expansion of the empire and the growth of its responsibilities. It is a truism that the inexorable rules of fashion, or society, or civilisation (call it what you may) have imposed upon these same classes an ever more and more expensive habit of education, and of life in almost all its aspects. The third point is closely connected with the second. Lord Selborne says that the chief difficulty of reorganising the parochial system, and of ensuring a settled ministry, "would actually be found in the poorest places." Precisely: any measure of disendowment must make its most immediate and acute effects felt in rural districts, and most severely in those parishes of such districts where there is no residential and well-to-do class beyond those tied to the soil by proprietary or farming interest. But, as all the world knows, these are just the places where the long-continued lowness of the price of agricultural produce has, even under existing conditions, made it difficult to carry on satisfactorily the parochial work of the Church. In fact, it comes to this; the evil effects of disendowment will be least felt where population is thick and wealth abounds; they will be most severely felt where population is thin, and the well-to-do are few and far between. In other words, disendowment will be least injurious, or even innocuous, where its evil results could be most easily repaired; it will be most mischievous where it will be most difficult, if

not impossible, to cure the mischief wrought by it. How can any earnest Churchman contemplate this prospect with equanimity? How can religious men of any creed regard it with indifference? Nay, how can any serious-minded Englishman, who gives the least care to the well-being of his countrymen, but shrink from thus jeopardising the efficient working, perhaps even the continued existence, of the fixed parochial ministrations of the Church in the agricultural counties? As Lord Selborne says, "if a law-giver were devising ideal institutions for a nation, I do not think he could imagine one more beneficial than that, in every place where any considerable number of people have settled habitations—in every such place as our parishes are—there shall be at least one man, educated, intelligent, and religious, whose life shall be dedicated to the especial business and duty of doing to all the people of that place all the good he can," etc., etc. (pp. 248, 249). And yet there are Churchmen who, in their explicable desire for disestablishment, would lightly, through disendowment, level a crushing blow at this precious inheritance of our land—who would paralyse, at all events for a time, this "ideal institution" just where it is most needed, just where it will be most difficult to replace its beneficent action by any elevating social influences. Many of the economical tendencies of the time are telling against the prosperity of remote and purely agricultural villages. Surely we may appeal to Churchmen to save our villages from the further calamity of the possible loss of their ancient privilege, the permanent and secured ministry of the clergyman of the Church of England. I have dwelt upon this particular possible consequence of disendowment, partly because it is one which my lot in life happens to make of special interest to myself, and partly because it is a contingency, the public and social evil of which will, I think, touch many

minds which do not regard this question entirely from a denominational or ecclesiastical standpoint. But, after all, this is only one illustration of the probable effects of disendowment. Disendowment must injuriously affect—at all events for some time—every portion of the organisation of the National Church, which has never been so spiritual, so zealous, and so beneficent in its manifold labours as now. It must withdraw from spiritual objects an income which can only be replaced, if replaced it be, by excessive sacrifice on the part of the Churchmen to the detriment of all kinds of good works. And for what will religion be called upon to receive this heavy punishment, and to suffer this grievous loss? Who, and what, are to be the gainers by this gratuitous transfer of funds from sacred to secular uses? The gainers—the only gainers—will be the particular philanthropic fads that may chance to find an ephemeral favour with the accidental party majority of some one, possibly short-lived, Parliament.

IV.

The Parochial System

BY EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, D.D.

NOTHING but the briefest sketch of the rise of the parochial system in the Church can be attempted here ; but without some such sketch it would be impossible to understand the system properly, or to comprehend what the theory of it really is. In the early days of Christianity, in both East and West alike, nearly every great town had its own bishop, and since throughout the Roman Empire each important city had the surrounding district attached to it for civil purposes, the Church was easily furnished with a natural limit for ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The city, together with the neighbouring district, became the "diocese" or, as it was originally termed, the "parish,"* being worked by the bishop with his cathedral staff of presbyters and deacons. But around and between these compact dioceses there lay rural districts to which (as the words "pagani" and "heathen" testify) the gospel penetrated but slowly. These districts would be gradually evangelized by the clergy from the towns, who returned after their missionary tours to the cathedral centres to which they were attached. Naturally, however, as the country districts became more and more Christianized, necessity arose for providing a more permanent ministry

* See BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, IX. ii. 2.

for them; and as it was not advisable to create a fresh bishopric for every new community, presbyters and deacons were detached from the staff of the city church, and sent not merely *ad prædicandum*, but also *ad regendum*. The connection of the bishop with the whole district thus evangelized was maintained by his visitation, and by the fact that the chrism was blessed, and Confirmation (at least throughout the West) was administered by him personally; and there are traces that at one time the idea of diocesan unity was kept up by a practice of the bishop sending round to the presbyters of the daughter churches a portion of the Eucharist consecrated by him on the Sunday.* At first it would appear that the presbyters were still on the roll of the city clergy, received their allowance from the common fund, and were liable to be recalled by the bishop;† but by degrees, as time elapsed, they obtained fixity of tenure, and instead of being regarded as merely mission clergy came to occupy the position known to us as that of parish priests. The above account holds good, broadly speaking, for continental Europe; but in England it must be remembered that the development of the diocesan system was carried out on rather different lines, and hence the rise of the parochial system requires separate treatment. In this country the dioceses were not limited to single towns with their surrounding districts. From the first they were of far wider extent, and were in many cases co-extensive with the tribe or the kingdom.‡ The popular idea that at a given time these large dioceses were formally parcelled out by a deliberate act into so many distinct parishes may be dismissed from our minds at once. In truth, as Bishop Stubbs says, the system, the

* *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne), i. p. 168.

† See *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s.v. "Parish," vol. ii. p. 1555.

‡ See FREEMAN'S *Norman Conquest*, ii. 603; iv. 413.

foundation of which is traditionally assigned to Archbishop Theodore, "needed no foundation." * It grew up naturally and spontaneously. The towns here in early days never had the same importance as on the Continent. The bishop was bishop of the tribe or kingdom rather than of the city, and in some instances his "bishopstool" might move from place to place according as the Court moved to one or other of the royal villis. So long as what may be called the missionary stage of the Church continued, the bishop and his clergy would endeavour to evangelize the whole territory for which they were responsible by missionary tours and circuits. So Bede describes Chad as "traveling about, not on horseback, but after the manner of the apostles, on foot, preaching the gospel in towns, in the open country, in cottages, villages, and castles" (A.D. 664).† Thus even when, as under the influence of Aidan, churches were built in various places,‡ they were not at first served by resident priests, but were merely used from time to time as centres of mission work. "Aidan and his company," says the latest writer on the subject, "would go to one of them, stay for a while preaching, administering the blessed sacraments, and working the surrounding district, and then either return to Lindisfarne, or go on to some other church, and, after Aidan had left, no more services would be held in the little church until he or some other missionary paid another visit to the district."§ Naturally, however, it soon became necessary to make some more permanent provision for the dwellers in different localities; nor are we without information of the manner in which the change from an itinerant to a settled ministry was brought about. Shortly after the

* *Constitutional History*, i. 227.

† BEDE, iii. 28.

‡ *Ibid.*, iii. 3: "Construebantur ergo ecclesiae per loca."

§ HUNT'S *History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 79.

middle of the seventh century we find Cedd dedicating churches and ordaining priests and deacons among the East Saxons,* and apparently the churches were served by their own clergy, and were not mere mission stations. It is fairly claimed, therefore, by Mr. Hunt that these ordinations may "mark a step towards the establishment of a settled ministry."† Rather later than this the provisions of Archbishop Theodore's Penitential imply the existence of local divisions, each under the charge of its own priest;‡ and in Eddi's *Life of Wilfrid* the bishop is described as moving about his diocese, not only baptizing and confirming, but also ordaining priests and deacons for various places.§ Moreover, when some wealthy landowner had built a church upon his estate it was natural that he should prefer to have a priest definitely attached to it rather than to be dependent upon the casual ministrations of itinerant evangelists; nor was it unreasonable that he should desire some voice in the selection of the priest (especially if he himself provided the endowments for his support), and this was often conceded to him, and originated the system of private patronage. So Bede, in his account of John of Beverley, gives incidental notices of his visits to different parts of his diocese, in order to consecrate churches which had been built by two counts.|| This refers to the closing years of the seventh century (c. 685), and between forty and fifty years later a still stronger light is thrown upon the subject by a passage in Bede's letter to Egbert, Archbishop of York, which is worth transcribing in full:—

"Because the extent of country over which the diocese committed to your government extends precludes the possibility of

* BEDE, iii. 22: "Fecit per loca ecclesias, presbyteros et diaconos ordinavit."

† *History*, p. 98.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 160, and BRIGHT'S *Early English Church History*, p. 362.

§ EDDI, c. 21.

|| BEDE, v. 4, 5.

your personally visiting the whole of it, and preaching the Word of God in every village and farmstead, even within the course of a whole year, it is very necessary that you should associate with yourself a greater number of assistants in the holy work, by ordaining presbyters and appointing teachers who may apply themselves in every village to preaching the Word of God and consecrating the holy mysteries, and, above all, to performing the office of holy baptism when opportunity occurs."*

Nothing could show more clearly than this how our parochial system came into existence. It implies that in Egbert's day it was becoming general, and was felt to be a necessity if the spiritual needs of the whole country were to be properly provided for. This letter was written in 734 or 735, and only about twelve years later a canon was passed by the Council of Clovesho (747), requiring presbyters to be diligent in baptizing, teaching, and visiting *in the districts assigned to them by the bishops*,† which may fairly be taken as indicating that by the middle of the eighth century the change from an itinerant to a settled ministry was complete, and that the parochial system was so far thoroughly established. Into questions connected with the appointment of tithe and endowments for the maintenance of the clergy there is no need to enter here;‡ nor does it appear to be necessary to trace out the subsequent development of the organization of the parochial system, or to consider how far the civil divisions of the township or the manor were followed in marking out the boundaries of the ecclesiastical parish.§ It will be

* *Ep. ad Egb.*, 5.

† Council of Clovesho, Canon 9: "Ut presbyteri per loca et regiones laicorum, quæ sibi ab episcopis provinciæ insinuata et injuncta sunt, evangelicæ atque apostolicæ prædicationis officium in baptizando, et docendo, ac visitando sub legitimo ritu ac diligenti cura studeant explere."—HADDAN and STUBBS, iii. 365.

‡ Reference may be made to the late Lord SELBORNE'S *Defence of the Church of England*, part ii.

§ See STUBBS, *Constitutional History*, i. 85, 227.

sufficient for our present purpose to be content with the citation of the lucid description given by Bishop Hobhouse of the constitution and organization of the fully developed mediæval parish, which he defines as "the community dwelling in an area defined by the Church, organized for Church purposes, subject to Church authority."

"The area," he tells us, "might coincide with a manor or manors, or a piece of a manor or a tithing, or it might differ from all other defined areas. It was at times altered by Church authority.

"Within this area every resident was a parishioner, and as such owed his duty of worship and contribution to one stated Church, and his duty of confession and submission to the official guidance of a stated pastor, entitled his Rector, or the Rector's deputy, entitled Vicar.

"There was no choice allowed.

"The community was completely organized with a constitution which recognized the rights of the whole and of every adult member to a voice in self-government, but kept the self-governing community under a system of inspection, and (if need should be) restraint from central authority.

"The necessary officers were (1) the Rector or his deputy; (2) the Wardens, the chosen representatives of the parishioners.

"The whole adult population were accounted parishioners, and had an even voice when assembled for consultation under the Rector. Seeing that both sexes served the office of Warden, there can be no doubt that both had a vote.

"The place of meeting was the church. The name of 'vestry' as applied to the Church Council nowhere appears.

"It must have grown up after the date when vestry-rooms grew up, and were large enough to contain an assembly. These must have been rare. In most country parishes the churches served for the parishioners' council-room."*

From this has come the parochial system as we know it to-day. And so natural and familiar does it appear that

* *Churchwardens' Accounts*, printed for the Somerset Record Society, p. xi. The period to which Bishop Hobhouse specially refers is defined as "within the limits of 1349 and 1560."

it is difficult to conceive of the Church without it. Nor, indeed, is it easy to see how her work could effectively be done unless some such system were in existence. The sketch just given may show how it was adopted by no deliberate act, but as a practical necessity. In the early days of the conversion of a country, when the mass of the population are heathen and Christian ministers are few and far between, mission stations are all that are required, and there is no need to define precisely any boundaries within which missionary tours shall be confined. But when once the Church has passed beyond the missionary stage some definition of limits becomes a necessity if confusion and overlapping is to be avoided, and it may be confidently claimed that without a parochial system no Church could be a really *national* one. In voluntary communities, which are content with gathering in their own adherents, who are drawn together by preference or whim, the congregational system may be the natural and most suitable one. But in the case of a Church which has not only received a commission to preach the gospel to every creature, but has been especially charged to feed Christ's sheep and tend His lambs, and which recognizes a responsibility to all the baptized, whether or no they may acknowledge it, it is hard to see how, when once the purely missionary stage in the conversion of a country is at an end, it would be possible for her to fulfil the duties entrusted to her without something like a parochial system. She claims to be the Church of the nation, and for centuries *was* co-extensive with the nation; and although Hooker's ideal of Church and State as the same body under different aspects must be sorrowfully confessed to be at present an impossible one, yet the Church cannot forget that she is still the National Church, and that therefore not only have all the baptized a right to claim her ministrations, but it is her duty

to bring the gospel and the privileges of the Church within the reach of every member of the nation. At the most solemn moment of their ordination she tells her ministers that it is their duty "to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." And having said this she addresses to them this weighty charge:—

"Have always therefore printed in your remembrance, how great a treasure is committed to your charge. For they are the sheep of Christ, which He bought with His death, and for whom He shed His blood. The Church and Congregation whom you must serve is His Spouse and His Body. And if it shall happen the same Church, or any member thereof, to take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue. Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your Ministry towards the children of God, towards the Spouse and Body of Christ; and see that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life."

These words are sufficiently solemn and awe-inspiring in any case. But without some such provision as that afforded by the parochial system, they might well create a feeling of despair in the minds of those who are called to listen to them. The ideal is indeed a lofty one. The best and most laborious parish priest falls sadly short of it. But at least he has the consciousness that the range of his responsibilities is defined for him; and, his duty lying within a definite area, he is saved from the bewilder-

ment and dissipation of energy which would inevitably result from a general commission to be exercised in an unlimited sphere, as wide as the world itself.

Again, to look at the matter from the layman's point of view, it is much that wherever in any part of the land he may find himself, there within reasonable distance he finds a church to which he can bring his children to be baptized ; * where he can claim for them religious instruction in the faith of their fathers ; † where he and his can worship and receive the Bread of Life. He finds there also a minister to whose services he has a right, whose duty it is to provide him and his with all that is necessary to their souls' health, to prepare his children for Confirmation, ‡ to minister to them in sickness as well as in health, "to instruct and comfort them in their distress," and with a special charge that when death approaches "he shall not slack to

* See Canon 68 : "No minister shall refuse or delay to christen any child, according to the form of the Book of Common Prayer, that is brought to the church to him upon Sundays or Holy Days to be christened."

† See Canon 59 : *Ministers to catechize every Sunday*. "Every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, upon every Sunday and Holy Day, before Evening Prayer shall, for half an hour, or more, examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish, in the Ten Commandments, the Articles of the Belief, and in the Lord's Prayer : and shall diligently hear, instruct, and teach them the Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. . . . And if any minister neglect his duty herein, let him be sharply reprovèd upon the first complaint, and true notice thereof given to the Bishop or Ordinary of the place. If after submitting himself he shall willingly offend therein again, let him be suspended ; if so the third time, there being little hope that he will be therein reformed, then excommunicated, and so remain until he be reformed." Cf. the first rubric after the Catechism in the Book of Common Prayer.

‡ See Canon 61 : *Ministers to prepare children for Confirmation*. "Every minister, that hath cure and charge of souls, for the better accomplishing of the orders prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer concerning Confirmation, shall take especial care that none shall be presented to the Bishop for him to lay his hands upon, but such as can render an account of their faith, according to the Catechism in the said Book contained. And when the Bishop shall assign any time for the performance of that part of his duty, every such minister shall use his best endeavour to prepare and make able, and likewise to procure as many as he can to be then brought, and by the Bishop to be confirmed."

do his last duty.”* This is the real value of the parochial system. If only it is properly worked it enables the Church to cover the whole ground, and to provide for the spiritual wants of all her children; and that this is widely recognized by the people themselves scarcely needs to be proved. The parish priest is the natural resource to which they turn in every emergency. They know that they have a right to his ministrations, and they have learnt to look (perhaps too eagerly) to the vicarage for the relief of their temporal necessities,† as well as those of a more purely spiritual character. It is simply owing to this that pastoral visiting has become such a great reality in the Church of England. The parish priest goes from house to house with a feeling that he is responsible at least

* See Canon 69: *Ministers not to defer Christening if the child be in danger.* “If any minister, being duly, without any manner of collusion, informed of the weakness and danger of death of any infant unbaptized in the parish, and thereupon desired to go or come to the place where the said infant remaineth, to baptize the same, shall either wilfully refuse so to do, or of purpose, or of gross negligence, shall so defer the time, as, when he might conveniently have resorted to the place, and have baptized the said infant, it dieth, through his default, unbaptized; the said minister shall be suspended for three months; and before his restitution shall acknowledge his fault, and promise before his Ordinary, that he will not wittingly incur the like again. Provided that where there is a Curate or substitute, this Constitution shall not extend to the Parson or Vicar himself, but to the Curate or substitute present.” Canon 67: *Ministers to visit the sick.* “When any person is dangerously sick in any parish, the Minister or Curate, having knowledge thereof, shall resort unto him or her (if the disease be not known, or probably suspected, to be infectious), to instruct and comfort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no Preacher, or if he be a Preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient. And when any is passing out of this life, a bell shall be tolled, and the Minister shall not then slack to do his last duty.”

† The relief of temporal necessities, it must not be forgotten, is distinctly contemplated in the Book of Common Prayer as among the duties of the clergy. See the fifth question in the “Form and Manner of Making Deacons.” “It is his office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the Parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the Parishioners or otherwise.” Cf. the directions in connection with the Communion Service regarding the “Alms for the Poor,” and Canon 84, which requires *a chest for alms in every church.*

for offering the ministrations of the Church, and his own services as the representative of the Church, to all those in the district committed to his care. It is theirs to accept or reject them, but it is his bounden duty to offer them; and he is able to do so with the sure feeling that in the vast majority of cases this fact will be recognized and admitted by those to whom he goes. There will be houses, no doubt, where the door is rudely shut in his face, but these will be few and far between. In almost every case he will receive a civil welcome, even from those who decline his ministrations. They recognize that in visiting them he is within his rights; and thus that which, were it not for the parochial system, might not unreasonably be regarded as an officious impertinence, and which in the case of other bodies is so regarded, becomes in the case of the National Church so much a thing of course that it is looked for by the people themselves as a right, and its absence is bitterly resented. Further, the way in which a large number of persons who never enter the church at any other time desire to be married there, to have their children baptized there, and to be buried with the Church's service is not without significance. It was said by a speaker at the London Church Congress last year that Mr. Charles Booth had stated to him in conversation that in his investigations and inquiries into the condition of the poor in East London, few things had struck him more forcibly than the strong hold which the parochial system has upon the people; and it is striking to find that in those towns where there are to be found large bodies of Jews, absolutely outside the Christian Church, the same thing holds good. They have a real respect for what they consider the properly-constituted authorities, and work among them is found by experience to be most fruitfully carried on upon parochial lines and through parochial organizations.

It is, however, not claimed for the system that it is perfect. There are obvious defects and weaknesses in it. Some of these arise from misconception of the theory of the system, and (as will be shown presently) would to a great extent disappear were the true theory more widely recognized and more completely put into practice. Others may be termed accidental, and might be remedied by judicious reforms, which would, in some cases, be consequent upon an application to Parliament. It may be conceded at once that the division of parishes and the allocation of endowments is not always satisfactory. In some of our large towns there still may be found huge overgrown parishes containing a population of 20,000 or 30,000, where the resources of the Church are wholly incapable of providing a sufficient staff of clergy, or the necessary accommodation in church or mission-rooms for anything like a reasonable proportion of the population, and where subdivision is urgently demanded. But in a large number of cases it appears to the present writer that subdivision has been carried too far, and that the work of the Church has been hindered rather than promoted by it. When Dr. Hook, at Leeds in 1844, wisely and nobly (for the personal sacrifice involved in his action was very great) set himself to procure an Act of Parliament for the subdivision of the vast unwieldy parish containing 152,054 souls,* of which he found himself in charge, what weighed most of all with him was the desire to "restore the parochial system," and to "provide for every poor man a pastor, and for every poor child a school."† The measure was undoubtedly of incalculable benefit to Leeds; but largely because care was taken not unduly to weaken the mother church, where Hook himself continued for many years to give by his administration

* See Dean STEPHENS' *Life of Dr. Hook*, vol. ii. p. 160.

† See Dr. HOOK's letter to his parishioners.—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 171.

practical proof that the Church's work is best done by a strong man at the head of a large staff of curates and Church-workers, where it is possible to create *esprit de corps*, and where the services of the Church can not only be frequent, but maintained with dignity and beauty. And what Hook first did at Leeds has been done in other places since his day. Bishop Hills, who had received his training under Hook, did it under somewhat different circumstances at Great Yarmouth, and in more recent days conspicuous instances of the advantage of maintaining such strong centres have been given by such churches as Stepney Parish Church and S. Mary's, Portsea.

On the other hand, the aim of Church Extension movements has too often been the multiplication of small parishes, each of which of necessity forms a weak centre, possesses but a mean and cheap church incapable of accommodating a really large congregation—being too small perhaps for the Bishop to hold a Confirmation in it if the neighbouring parishes are to join—and involves an immense increase of cost and machinery in working. In such a parish, too poor to maintain a curate, with a population perhaps not of sufficient magnitude to constitute a sufficiently strong claim for help from one or other of our "Home Missions" Societies, an unfortunate parish priest is set down, and left to struggle on single-handed, personally responsible for everything—for the maintenance of the Church services, the baptisms, the marriages, perhaps the funerals, the sermons, the schools, the classes, the preparation of Confirmation candidates, the personal dealing with individual souls, the visiting, and the manifold organizations which modern developments have taught us to regard as necessary; his own secretary, his own treasurer, his own committee. And so he struggles on, utterly unable to cope with the situation in which he finds himself, until in despair at the possibility of ever creating

a satisfactory state of things, he loses heart and hope and all power of initiative; his own spiritual life deteriorates, and he sinks into a state of "contented dejection," from which nothing short of a spiritual earthquake can rouse him. The picture is a gloomy one, but it is only too true to life; and though such cases may only occur in our larger towns, yet a not altogether dissimilar picture might be drawn of what is to be found in some country districts, where the *isolation* is more keenly felt than in the towns, and work single-handed is attended with as great, or even greater, difficulties. It might be far better for small villages in close proximity to be grouped together and worked as a single parish than for each to have its own separate organization, maintained at a considerable expense, and yet of necessity too weak to be really effective. The Church has undoubtedly suffered greatly in the past from pluralities, and some measure like the Pluralities Act of 1838* and its successors was greatly needed; but experience has shown that some modification of it would be a real boon. As the law now stands it is permissible for two benefices to be held together, "the churches of which are within four miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of which does not exceed £200."† It is this latter provision which sometimes works badly. Here is a case in point. In a large town there are two adjoining parishes, the churches of which are only a few hundred yards apart. One church is a fine one, accommodating 800 persons, while the other is only built for 270. The population of the two parishes together amounts to 13,000, but of this number *at least 8,000 are Jews*. It would be clearly to the advantage of the Church that the two parishes should be worked as one, and that the smaller church, if retained at all, should be used as a mission church; but because the value of each living

* 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106.

† 48 & 49 Vict. c. 54, § 14.

happens to be slightly over £200 a year, it is impossible for them to be held together, and each has to be worked separately, with all the cost of the two distinct organizations to be maintained, one of the two incumbents having, out of a population of 7,000, only 1,000 nominal Christians, all the rest being Jews. Plainly some power of dealing with cases such as this is needed. Either it should be possible for a dispensation to be granted, so that the two livings might be held by the same person, or there should be some means of suppressing one or other of the parishes without having recourse to the clumsy and costly process of securing a special Act of Parliament. This brings us to the consideration of a matter which urgently demands attention. Everybody knows how many of the parishes in the city of London have been depleted of their population, and left with practically no resident parishioners. But few persons seem to be aware that the same kind of thing is going on in many of our large towns. The residential quarters of twenty or thirty years ago are now occupied solely by business premises and offices. The tradesmen no longer reside over their shops. Whole streets have been removed to make room for huge railway stations with their goods departments. Insanitary areas are cleared away. "Works," warehouses, and timber-yards cover vast spaces of ground. The whole population is moving out into the suburbs; and as tram lines and suburban railways are extended, the tendency is to move further and further away. The result is that the population of some of the parishes in the central parts of our towns is shrinking with extraordinary rapidity, so that parishes which not very many years ago contained perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 persons will now be found to contain only a few hundreds. The churches naturally are nearly empty. What else can be expected? When they were built an entirely different state of things

was in existence. They were needed then, for there was a population to fill them. The population has now moved miles away, but there the churches still stand, and there the incumbents still remain, the only possible way of removing church and incumbent to one or other of the rapidly-growing suburbs containing hundreds of small houses for artisans being by means of a special Act of Parliament. Such Acts have been obtained both in London and for Birmingham and Liverpool, but it is a difficult and costly process to obtain them. What is urgently wanted is a general Act applicable to the whole country, enabling the Church herself to deal with such cases without reference to the legislature on every occasion, to unite benefices where inquiry shows it to be desirable, and to remove such churches and parishes as may be no longer needed to districts where they are really wanted, and where they would prove a strength, and not a weakness, to the Church.*

Again, it cannot be denied that our present system is somewhat lacking in elasticity. An incumbent is appointed to a parish, and it may soon appear that he is what is popularly termed "a square man in a round hole." Perhaps he comes from an agricultural parish in the south to one of our large northern mining or manufacturing centres, and finds that he can understand neither the character nor the speech of those to whom he is called to minister. Or he may have been born and bred in the north, with traces of the northern accent still lingering in his speech, and he finds himself appointed to a living in an agricultural county in the south, where he has to mix with and influence farmers and country squires, and a whole class of people whose way of looking at things

* Since this was written it has been announced that a bill for this purpose is to be introduced in Parliament, and it is much to be hoped that it may be energetically pressed forward and passed in the present session.

and habitual range of interests is very different from anything to which he has been accustomed. Perhaps he has lived all his life in a large town, and knows nothing of the country and country life, when in middle age he is called upon to take charge of a rural parish, and to the great amusement of his parishioners betrays his ignorance by a request to the congregation made from the pulpit that they will bring *primroses* for the decorations for the approaching harvest festival, or by a suggestion to the farmers, made in the simplicity of his heart from a laudable desire to minimize Sunday labour and increase his afternoon congregation, that they had better put off the milking till Monday! The man may be an excellent man, devout and earnest, perhaps in his own line learned; he may be thoroughly capable of doing good work elsewhere, but he is clearly out of place where he is, and it is very soon seen that he is oppressed by the burden of the particular parish to which he has been appointed. He tells you that his parish is a peculiar one, and that he cannot understand his people; and they tell you that their parson is peculiar, and that they cannot understand him. The best thing to be done is to get him out of the place as soon as possible, but under our present system how hopelessly difficult it is to do this! The very fact that he is overweighted and obviously not doing well there renders it unlikely that he will attract the attention of patrons and receive offers of other livings; and there he is fixed for life to the great disadvantage of himself and also of his people. He loses heart and hope, and his people know it. Under the Wesleyan system he would be moved on in three years' time, and would thus escape the danger of that stagnation of which John Wesley had evidently seen a good deal, and which perhaps more than anything else blinded him to the real value of the parochial system. But among us there is at present no

satisfactory remedy, though the need for one is great. An exchange of livings is the obvious one, and ought to work well; but, as things are, it is often difficult to effect satisfactorily. Exchanges have been resorted to so frequently under circumstances which were not altogether creditable, and have sometimes resulted so disastrously for both parishes concerned that bishops and patrons of livings are not unnaturally shy of them. They are not the proper remedy where an incumbent has involved himself in debt, or has been guilty of grave indiscretion, or even of something worse. But every bishop must know of many cases in which a really good man is out of place—a square man in a round hole—who could honestly and without reserve be recommended for a parish of a different character. As it is now an advertisement or the services of a clerical agency is the medium commonly resorted to by a clergyman who is desirous of effecting an exchange. Negotiations are entered into between two parties, and when the bishops and patrons concerned are approached and make the necessary inquiries they are thought very hard-hearted if they place difficulties in the way, pressure being often brought to bear upon them, rather unfairly, to induce them to give their consent to an exchange, the advantage of which may appear to them extremely doubtful. To avoid this would it not be possible for properly-regulated diocesan agencies to be established, where the initiative and effective control rested with the bishop himself? If this could be done exchanges might well be effected through them without the slightest shadow of discredit or suspicion resting upon them.

Once more, it will perhaps be said that, although the parochial system may be excellent, and indeed indispensable, for country districts, yet it has broken down in the towns, where it is practically ignored by clergy and laity alike, and has been replaced by congregation-

alism. The statement is an exaggeration, but there is certainly an element of truth in it. That the parochial system is largely *tempered* by congregationalism is manifest to everybody. Nor need this be entirely a matter for regret. It has a good side to it, and, if not overdone, proves a strength to the Church. It is not only that differences of ritual and use exist in neighbouring parishes, though this may not unreasonably be taken into account. The Church cannot expect that all her laity will be possessed by so lofty a sense of duty as was the late Lord Selborne, whose chivalrous and devoted adherence to his parish church in London is well known; and, things being as they are, it is idle to insist that it is the bounden duty of a man to attend his own parish church in every case, when the service there is dull and unedifying, and when the provision for his spiritual needs is of the most meagre description possible, while in the next street there is a well-worked church with a bright and hearty service, and one which, he tells you, meets his wants and satisfies his spiritual desires. A far more important element in the consideration of the question lies in the fact that among very large numbers of the poor there grows up an extraordinarily strong attachment to the church—perhaps only a poorly furnished mission one—where they first learnt to worship and attended classes, and where they received their first communion. To them it is, and always will be, *home*. No other church can ever be quite the same. And when they leave the district and remove to another part of the town they still turn to it with childlike affection. They will walk long distances and undergo much self-denial to keep up their connection with it. It would be cruel to turn them away, or tell them that now they belong to another parish they must attend their own parish church. But besides being cruel, it would be useless. A large number would refuse to be coerced in such a matter. It

would simply mean that they drifted into careless ways, and the Church lost her hold on them altogether. But although in this way the parochial system is, as has been said, tempered by congregationalism, it by no means follows that it has been proved a failure in the towns. It is a real power still, and it is as true in them as in country districts that the Church could not fairly cover the ground without it. It is only in the purely *pastoral* work of shepherding the flock already gathered together that the congregational element at all comes in. For *aggressive and evangelistic work* the parochial system has lost none of its value. For these it is still essential to the well-being of the Church, and to her claim that she can meet and satisfy the spiritual needs of the nation as a whole.

The most serious objection of all to our parochial system yet remains to be considered. It is that it throws all the power into the hands of one man in each parish, and that if he prove himself unworthy of it the law so jealously protects his "rights" that it is very hard to dislodge him from his position. Recent legislation has indeed done something to make the removal of scandals a less impossible matter. The Benefices Act of 1898* contains very important provisions intended to guard against unfit appointments to livings being made, and allows the bishop to refuse to institute on certain specified grounds, which include "grave misconduct or neglect of duty in an ecclesiastical office, evil life, having by his conduct caused grave scandal concerning his moral character since his ordination;"† and the same Act gives the bishop power to inhibit an incumbent and appoint a curate where a properly constituted commission "reports that the ecclesiastical duties of a benefice are inadequately performed, and that this is due to the negligence of the incumbent of the

* 61 & 62 Vict. cap. 48.

† § 2 (1).

benefice in the performance of those duties.”* This is something to be thankful for, although it is to be feared that in practice it may be found a matter of extreme difficulty to prove such negligence; and there are probably in every diocese painful cases, which the Act would not touch, where utterly unfit men remain in their places and defy all attempts to get rid of them. Such cases, we honestly believe, are few and far between; but nevertheless they exist in sufficient number to prove that the hands of the bishops require strengthening if they are to deal with them effectively. Supposing, however, that all scandals were removed, and negligence in the discharge of duty were a thing unknown, the objection that our system places all the power in the hands of one man would still be a real one. Under a despotism the subject people may be well governed, happy, and contented. Nevertheless in the long run it is bad alike for the ruler and the ruled. So a clerical despotism is certainly bad for the clergy, and it behoves them to be greatly on their guard against a domineering spirit, impatience of control and interference of any kind, and a disposition which resents opposition. It is bad for the people, as even where it does not lead to active discontent it gives them no training whatever in self-government, encourages them to take no interest in ecclesiastical and parochial matters, and conduces to a complaisant acquiescence in having everything done for them, which is opposed to the whole spirit of Christianity. The Christian ministry, according to S. Paul, is a divine “gift” unto men “for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of ministering” (*πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας*),† and this should ever be recognised in

* § 9 (1).

† Eph. iv. 12. It is a pity that the revisers have obscured the meaning by retaining the comma after the words “for the perfecting” of the saints. It is omitted in Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text, and thus it is suggested that it is “unto the work of ministering” that the saints are to be “perfected.”

the parochial system. And, indeed, nothing can be clearer than the fact that that system was never intended to lead to the concentration of all authority and power in the hands of one man. To begin with, the facts with regard to its growth that have been set forth in the opening pages of this essay make it quite plain that *the diocese, and not the parish, is the true unit of the Church's system*, and that the parish priest is after all only the substitute for, or the representative of, the bishop in the particular locality entrusted to his care. There can be no doubt that this needs emphasizing at present. In the Middle Ages, when non-residence on the part of the bishops was the rule rather than the exception, the parochial clergy naturally acquired a position of greater authority and independence than had originally been intended to be given to them; and the force of circumstances has necessitated the continuance of this in modern times. We have no longer to complain of non-residence on the part of bishops. The days are past when Bishop Watson, finding no house of residence in the diocese of Llandaff, to which he had been appointed, could settle himself "in the beautiful district on the banks of Windermere," where he employed his time, as he proudly tells us, "not in field diversions and visiting," but "partly in supporting the religion and constitution of my country by seasonable publications, and principally in building farmhouses, blasting rocks, enclosing wastes, making bad land good, planting larches, etc." "By such occupations," he quaintly adds, "I have recovered my health, preserved my independence, set an example of a spirited husbandry, and honourably provided for my family."* But still with the huge overgrown dioceses over which they are called to preside, and with the manifold duties that are entrusted to them, it is an absolute impossibility

* Bishop WATSON'S *Anecdotes of his own Life*, quoted in ABBEY and OVERTON, vol. ii. p. 28.

for the bishops to make their supervision effective. The "Visitation" is little better than an empty, and sometimes irritating, ceremony. An occasional visit for a Confirmation, the consecration of a church, the opening of an organ, or the unveiling of a stained-glass window affords the only opportunity that the bishop has of making himself acquainted with what goes on in the majority of the parishes in his diocese. The man who is always on the spot is bound to have the power; and thus the parochial clergy have secured a position of greater independence from control, and more perfect freedom of action than is probably committed to any other subordinate officers in any community whatever. And yet the true theory has never been quite lost sight of. When a priest is appointed to a benefice, by the act of Institution or Collation the bishop formally commits to him "the care and government of the souls of the parishioners of the said parish," and authorises him "to preach the Word of God in the parish church," but he immediately adds the qualifying clause, "saving always to us and our successors our Episcopal rights." And that the bishop is ultimately responsible for the cure of souls in every part of his diocese is clearly recognized in various provisions to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, *e.g.* in the directions in the Preface concerning the action to be taken when any doubt arises as to the meaning of the provisions of the book,* in the "disciplinary rubrics" at the beginning of the Communion

* "Forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same; to appease all such diversity (if any arise), and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop."

Office,* in the order concerning the disposal of the money collected at the Offertory, which stands at the close of the same service,† and in the direction that in the case of the baptism of such as are of riper years due notice is to be given beforehand to the bishop.‡ But practically the theory has very little effect. The disciplinary rubrics are, unhappily, almost inoperative. In case of a difference of opinion between an incumbent and the churchwardens it is very doubtful whether the law would recognise the right of the bishop to direct the method of disposing of money collected at any other service but that of Holy Communion, many competent authorities holding that collections made at other services than this are at the absolute disposal of the incumbent; and with reference to the direction in the Preface we have recently been reminded that it is quite possible for a clergyman to declare that he has no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the Prayer-book, and consequently to ignore the directions of his bishop altogether. There is, of course, the oath of canonical obedience taken by every clergyman before his Ordination, but the force of this has been determined by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be very small indeed. It “does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the

* “Provided that every Minister so repelling any, as is specified in this, or the next precedent Paragraph of this Rubrick, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon.”

† “After the Divine Service ended, the money given at the Offertory shall be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses, as the Minister and Churchwardens shall think fit. Wherein if they disagree, it shall be disposed of as the Ordinary shall appoint.”

‡ “When any such persons, as are of riper years, are to be baptized, timely notice shall be given to the Bishop, or whom he shall appoint for that purpose, a week before at the least, by the Parents, or some other discreet persons; that so due care may be taken for their Examination, whether they be sufficiently instructed in the Principles of the Christian Religion; and that they may be exhorted to prepare themselves with Prayers and Fasting for the receiving of this holy Sacrament.”

bishop against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the bishop by law is authorized to impose.”* Yet, strangely enough, it is this which appears to be generally appealed to on both sides in the case of a difference between a parish priest and his bishop; whereas it has always seemed to the present writer that the promise of obedience solemnly made in the Ordination Service itself has a far wider scope, and ought to weigh heavily in many cases where the conscience would not be touched at all by the oath referred to above. The question in the Ordinal runs as follows:—

“Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you: following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgements?”

And the answer required from every clergyman, on the faith of which he is admitted to priest's orders, is this:—

“I will so do, the Lord being my helper.”

Now it must be borne in mind that the oath of canonical obedience has been *already* taken by the person who is called upon to make this answer; and it is not reasonable to think that the promise subsequently made is intended to be a mere repetition of this. Its scope is surely far wider. It lays a very solemn obligation upon the consciences of the clergy of the second and third orders of the ministry, binding them to compliance with their bishop's directions even in cases where such directions cannot be compulsorily enforced through any legal process. Of course there are limits, and it would seem that in the last resort the individual conscience must be the judge of what is to be regarded as a “godly monition” to which obedience has been promised. But to decide in any given

* Long v. Bishop of Capetown. See BLUNT and PHILLIMORE'S *Church Law*, p. 200.

case that a bishop's monition is *not* godly is a serious matter; and the presumption in every case will certainly be in favour of compliance.

So much it seemed desirable to say on a point which is often overlooked, in order to establish the fact that the parochial system was not intended to create a number of little despotisms subject to no superior authority. Of course, where great responsibility is entrusted, there a large measure of freedom of action is bound to accompany it; and the admirable results secured through the parochial system as a whole, may fairly be pointed to as largely due to the way in which power and responsibility are placed in the hands of the incumbents. But all the same, it was never seriously contemplated that the parochial system should render the Ignatian maxim, *μηδὲν ἄνευ ἐπισκόπου*, a dead letter. The whole theory of the episcopate and the diocesan system, as developed in the early Church, demand that episcopal oversight should be a reality and not a mere shadow; and it may be added that a more effective episcopal supervision is not only right in theory, but would assuredly be found good in practice, so that a well-considered measure for the increase of the episcopate would be one of the very best means for strengthening the parochial system.

Then also the subject must be considered from the other side, in regard to the incumbent's relations to his parishioners, as well as to his bishop, for while under one aspect the parish priest is the representative of the bishop and acts as his substitute, there is another not less important aspect in which he is, as it were, the embodiment of the local Church itself, and the representative of all his parishioners. The idea that the incumbent is the "Rector" or ruler of the flock, or even the "Curate," with the care of their souls, is not the whole truth; and and if it is insisted on to the exclusion of other ideas,

may easily become mischievous, and result in arrogant autocracy. He is not only the "Rector" or "Curate," he is also the "Parson"; *qui personam gerit ecclesiæ*, who "bears in his small sphere the person of the Church."* It is only quite recently that this point has begun to receive the attention due to it. For too long the laity have acquiesced in the view that the management of the affairs of the Church was the concern of the clergy, and that they themselves had no part or lot in it. Such a notion is wholly false. It finds no support whatever in Holy Scripture, in which the Church is represented not as a "simple hierarchy," but, on the contrary, as "hierarchy largely tempered by spiritual democracy,"† and from the pages of which we gather that the Christian laity were to have a large share in such matters as these: "general Church management; moral discipline; election and approbation of officers; financial provision."‡ It has been shown that in the primitive Church such a position was actually given to them, and that it was only very gradually, owing to certain tendencies at work in the Church, that they lost their share in her government.§ But it is probable that even in the Middle Ages they took a far larger share in the general Church life of the parish, and consequently were entrusted with considerably greater powers than the majority of persons imagine.

The theory of the parish which prevailed in mediæval times has been already set forth, and, if the researches of experts are to be trusted, the share of power to which the laity were admitted was anything but small. It is therefore much to be hoped that if the Church Reform League, which is taking the matter up in earnest, should

* MOBERLY'S *Bampton Lectures* for 1868, p. 50.

† GORE in *Essays on Church Reform*, p. 9.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

§ See RACKHAM'S "Essay on the Position of the Laity in the Early Church" in the volume just alluded to.

succeed in formulating any plan for restoring to them their rights, and, together with this, for securing from them the performance of their duties, there will be no disposition on the part of the clergy to place any obstacles in the way of its adoption. It is certainly right that the faithful laity should not only be protected from arbitrary and high-handed action on the part of the parish priest in regard to the conduct of the services of the Church—and none can doubt that there have really been grievances in this matter—but that they should also have an effective voice in the management of ecclesiastical matters, and not be treated like children who have no share in the settlement of the affairs of the household. But it is hard to resist the conviction that the real difficulty in the way of formulating any reasonable and workable scheme lies quite as much in the apathy of the laity as in any supposed clerical unwillingness for reform. It is not meant that there would be no opposition from the clergy—undoubtedly there would be some; but it is the present writer's belief that it would be confined to a comparatively small minority, and that the great body of the parish priests would sincerely welcome any reform which gave them a more constitutional position and more effectual support and help from their lay parishioners. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that so far there has been no indication of any very widespread desire for a substantial measure of reform on the part of the laity. Many might be willing to accept power to control or interfere without responsibility for duties to be done. But that is not what is wanted; and where we have failed most conspicuously is in creating a genuine sense of *responsibility* for the healthy Church life of the parish on the part of the laity. They respond to the calls made upon their purses often with great generosity; and it would be utterly untrue to say that there are none among them who have learnt the

lesson of personal service. The Church owes much to the work of devoted laymen and women in all classes of society, from the highest to the lowest ; but it has to be sorrowfully confessed that there is still a great deal to be done before we shall have succeeded in convincing every communicant that the Christian ministry was founded not so much to minister to him as to set him to work for others, as it exists "for the perfecting of the saints *unto the work of ministering.*"

It is only when the great body of our people have realized what this means that the true strength and the full value of the parochial system will be seen.

V.

Convocation

BY W. H. HUTTON, B.D.

THOSE who look, in Church matters, below the surface which is ruffled by our present discontents, see clearly that the question which it is most important for the future to solve is that of the limits of the Church's power to govern herself.

An enlarged authority of self-government is demanded by many Churchmen as a right, and is allowed by some sagacious statesmen to be a needed reform. If the question should come within the range of practical politics—and it depends upon Churchmen to bring it there—it is well that we should understand what is the present position in this regard which the British Constitution allows to the lawful assemblies of the English Church. We are asking, “May the Church legislate, and on what subjects, and under what safeguards?” We should begin by considering that she already possesses legislative bodies, and by inquiring what are their constitutions and what their powers.

The history of the Convocations of Canterbury and York is very far from being a matter of merely antiquarian interest. It throws, at many points, light on the nature of the English character and the lines of English progress. It has its lessons by the way for the politician and the ecclesiastic.

It is perhaps impossible to say with certainty when and how the Convocations began; but the Church Councils of which Bede gives us the records are the first English examples of the working out of one necessary consequence of the existence of an organised Church.

So long as there were two organisations, the Scotie and the English, they could meet only to confer. Thus they gathered "all the ranks in the Church system" at Whitby in 664, and the assembly was brought together, if not by the commandment, certainly according to the will, of princes. It was King Oswiu who opened the discussion: it was his voice which pronounced the decision of the whole matter. But this was not strictly a Church Synod (though that is the name which Bede gives it). The national assemblies of our Church begin with the great Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus.

At Hertford, on September 24th, 673, Theodore, in the words of Bede, "assembled a council of bishops, together with those who loved and knew the canonical statutes of the fathers, very many masters of the Church." The details of their meeting, so far as we know them, are not important to us to-day, but there are certain points which clearly appear, and which are of value in our historical retrospect. Briefly, they are these: (1) It was Theodore who summoned and who presided. There is no mention of the action of kings. (2) There is no record of any lay interference or concern in the Council. (3) There is no reference to the opinion, or authority, of the mother Church of Rome. (4) The matters on which there was legislation concerned organisation, discipline, morals. They touched lay folk only as they came into direct relations with the Church. It is clear that it was regarded as certain that, in whatever way, this legislation would be put in force.

The principles which were here implied, with the

possible exception of the first (of which more hereafter), have regulated ever since that day the Church's view of her functions, of her duties to the people and of her relation to the State.

The second Council, that of Hatfield, in 680, emphasises the fact that the national Church claimed to make declaration, when need should be, of matters of fundamental faith. It accepted the five General Councils, and confessed the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

These Councils were presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the provincial organisation of the English Church was not then complete. From about 733 the provincial authority of the see of York began, and from that time provincial assemblies were convoked by the northern primate. The two provinces have two separate assemblies. From the eighth century the Synods of the English Church ceased to be national and became provincial.

The Convocations thus formed included, it must be remembered, clerics other than bishops, though the archbishop who summoned them did not always summon exactly the same classes. Beside official persons, such as abbats, deans, and archdeacons, representatives of the parochial clergy were on some occasions summoned, before the organisation of the representation of the Commons in Parliament.

The history thus begun has been a chequered one. We need only consider some of its critical dates. The action of the Papacy and the issue of legatine commissions did not affect the essential features of English Councils. They followed in the main the precedent of the Council of Hertford. The epochs in their history seem to be four.

1. The reign of Edward I. The organisation of a national Parliament, perfected in 1295, was based by the

English Justinian on the principle, "quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbetur"; and he was as anxious that every estate should have the power to express its assent as that the legislation of Parliament should affect every man in the land. The plan which he formed to secure the attendance of representatives of the clergy, as well as of the Commons, involved the issue of a special summons. In this the position of the Church as a separate estate, fully recognised by law as in possession of an established status, was made evident. The diocesan bishops were summoned individually to consult with the king. To each writ was added a special clause, instructing the bishops to procure the attendance of the prior (or dean) of the cathedral church and of the archdeacon *in propriis personis*, with one fit proctor for each cathedral chapter and two from each diocese, having full power to act for the rest. This summons was solely for the purposes of a national Parliament. It was not designed to affect ecclesiastical matters, except so far as they had always been treated in national Councils and Parliaments of the State. It left the Ecclesiastical Councils, or Convocations, as it found them. There was a national Parliament of the State, but the Church retained her provincial divisions.

As the attempt to procure the representation of all estates in the national Parliament did not affect powers of the Convocations of the Church, neither did the failure of the attempt. The clergy, clinging to the privileges and the responsibilities of their separation, would not take part in the national assemblies of the State according to the scheme of Edward I., though the prelates, of course, to whose position this new form of writ made no difference, continued to take such part as they had always taken. The failure of Edward's scheme left untouched the power of the clergy to tax themselves

separately in their Convocations. This power would probably have been abandoned had the clerical proctors consented to assemble with the Commons: it would have been natural, perhaps, that the two estates should in such matters act together. But as it was, the power, not, strictly speaking, ecclesiastical at all, remained with the ecclesiastical assemblies.

2. The second epoch is the crisis of the reign of Henry VIII., represented by the submission of the clergy. There is much in these events of 1532 which has historical interest but nothing more: such are the complaint of the Commons against the Ordinaries, the two answers to the complaint, the articles submitted by the King on May 10th for the subscription of the Convocation of Canterbury, with the Bishops' reply. But the only documents which retain their importance to-day are the Submission of the Clergy and the Act of Parliament which ratified that submission by the full sanction of the State. These demand insertion here.

The Submission of the Clergy runs as follows:—

“We your most humble subjects, daily orators, and beadsmen, of your Clergy of England, having our special trust and confidence in your most excellent wisdom, your princely goodness, and fervent zeal in the promotion of God's honour and Christian religion, and also in your learning, far exceeding in our judgment the learning of all other kings and princes that we have read of: and doubting nothing but that the same shall still continue and increase in your Majesty, first do offer and promise in *verbo sacerdotii* here unto your Highness, submitting ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will never from henceforth enact, put in ure, promulge, or execute any new canons or constitutions provincial, or any other new ordinance, provincial or synodal, in our convocations or synod, in time coming, which convocation is, always hath been, and must be assembled only by your high commandment of writ; only your Highness by your royal assent shall license us to assemble our convocation, and to make,

promulge, and execute such constitutions and ordinances as shall be made in the same, and thereto give your royal assent and authority.

“Secondarily, that whereas divers of the constitutions, and ordinances, and canons provincial or synodal, which have been heretofore enacted, and be thought to be not only much prejudicial to your prerogative royal, but also overmuch onerous to your Highness’s subjects; your clergy aforesaid is contented, if it may stand so with your Highness’s pleasure, that it be committed to the examination and judgement of your grace, and of thirty-two persons, whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether house of the temporalty, and the other sixteen of the clergy, all to be chosen and appointed by your most noble grace. So that finally whichsoever of the said constitutions, ordinances, or canons provincial or synodal shall be thought and determined by your grace, and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons, not to stand with God’s laws and the laws of your realm, the same to be abrogated and taken away by your grace and the clergy. And such of them as shall be seen by your grace, and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons to stand with God’s laws and the laws of your realm, to stand in full strength and power, your grace’s most royal assent and authority, once impetrate, fully given to the same.”

The confirmatory Act, after rehearsing and accepting this, proceeds :—

“Be it, therefore, now enacted by authority of this present parliament, according to the said submission and petition of the said clergy, That they nor any of them from henceforth shall presume to attempt, allege, claim, or put in ure any constitutions, or ordinances provincial, or synodals, or any other canons; nor shall enact, promulge, or execute any such canons, constitutions, or ordinance provincial, by whatever name or names they may be called, in their convocations in time coming, which always shall be assembled by authority of the king’s writ, unless the same clergy may have the king’s most royal assent and license to make, promulge, and execute such canons, constitutions, and ordinances provincial or synodal, upon pain of every one of the said clergy doing contrary to this act, and being thereof convict, to suffer imprisonment and make fine at the king’s will.”

The revision of the existing canons which, as the rest of the Act shows, was contemplated, was, it is well known, never accomplished. The history of the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, interesting in itself, does not belong to our subject. The canons and constitutions existing in 1532, where not repugnant to the laws and customs of the realm, or injurious to the prerogative of the Crown, remain in force, by authority of Parliament, to this day.

The settlement of 1532, therefore, involved four things :

- (1) That the Convocations can only be called together by the authority of the Crown.
- (2) That they can make no new canons without royal licence.
- (3) That the canons when made cannot have legal effect until they have received the royal assent.
- (4) That under no circumstances can any canon have force against the laws of the realm or the royal prerogative.

It would seem that these securities, which were regarded as sufficient by Henry VIII., might well be thought sufficient to-day. It would appear that they represent the whole of Parliament's dealing with the Convocations : no other Act of Parliament save this (25 Hen. VIII. c. 19) touches the ancient assemblies of the Church.

3. The third important epoch may be thought to be the reigns of the first two Stewarts. The canons of 1604, enacted by the Convocation of Canterbury under royal licence, were "diligently viewed and deliberately examined" by the Convocation of York and received the authorisation of both provinces. They have therefore the force of law, and it is to be presumed, following the Act of Henry VIII., would be enforced by civil as well as ecclesiastical courts where they do not conflict with the common law or the royal prerogative. The Convocations

of 1640 have an almost equal importance. Not only did they both pass canons, which received the royal assent, and would appear to be still in force, as they have never been repealed (though the House of Commons, in the Long Parliament, passed a resolution that they contained matters contrary to the laws of the land, to the rights of Parliament, and to the liberty of the subject). But more important are the facts that the Convocation of 1640 continued to sit after the dissolution of Parliament, on the opinion of seven judges that "the Convocation being called by the King's writ under the great seal, doth continue until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the Parliament be dissolved"; that they sat under new writ continuing them *during pleasure*; and that they granted the King from the clergy £20,000 a year for six years, when the House of Commons had voted no supplies. It was this bold action of one estate, expressing its opinion contrary to that of another, which led to the arrangement between Archbishop Sheldon and Lord Chancellor Clarendon, in 1665, that the clergy should tacitly abandon their right separately to tax themselves.

4. The fourth epoch is one of controversy. On November 30th, 1689, the Convocations were given the royal licence to treat of alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, and to form canons and constitutions to be submitted to the Crown.

The attitude of the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation was so markedly antagonistic to the wishes of the Crown that Convocation was dissolved without treating of the business which they were empowered to consider, and it was not allowed to exercise its powers for several years. In 1697 the famous *Letter to a Convocation Man* gave the call to a bitter fray, in which the powers of the Church assemblies were exhaustively discussed. It even

declared that "to confer, debate, and resolve without the King's licence is, at common law, the undoubted right of Convocation." It was admitted that "Convocation cannot assemble without the assent of the King: his writ is necessary in order to it," but it was asserted that the Convocation and Parliament stood exactly on the same footing. "The One of these Courts is of the same Power and Use with regard to the Church as the Other is in respect to the State," and in the one as in the other, "the Prerogative Power of Assembling them by Writ doth not import a Power of Licensing or Confining them in their Debates, any more than it doth in the case of a Parliament." And as to the validity of canons passed with royal assent, it was claimed "that they need no confirmation of or by the Parliament, provided they do not impugn Common Law, Statutes, Customs, or Prerogative." The freedom to debate and resolve was controverted by Wake: and his *State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, etc.* argued that the Convocations could not treat of canons without a royal licence. He utterly destroyed Atterbury's contention of the parliamentary character of the Lower House. These disputes, prolific in violent literature, gave us also Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana*, the classic book of procedure in the Convocations.

From that time till 1852 nothing of importance to our subject happened. There were disputes, political and theological, and then came the long suspension of the powers of Convocation, during which it formally met and formally separated, and the public knowledge of the ancient bodies was confined, it was wittily said, to the fact "that they had once been active; but that of late a few clergymen, chosen they knew not how, met two or three bishops, they knew not where, and presented an address to the Crown, for what purpose they could not tell."

From this lethargy, as we all know, they were revived in 1852; and not the least of the services of Bishop Wilberforce were those connected with the revival of their powers and the encouragement of the exercise of those powers. The Convocation of Canterbury, and since 1861 that of York, have been, practically without dispute, in possession of the rights of free debate, and, under royal licence, of enacting a canon. Canons, too, have been passed with the royal assent, but no matter of the first importance has thus been decided apart from Parliament.

The addition of a House of Laymen to each Convocation, though it serves merely a consultative purpose, should not be regarded as of small importance. Any resolutions passed by these Houses would certainly receive most respectful consideration, and would be almost sure of acceptance by the clerical Houses; nor is there any reason why, practically though not formally, a great deal of important business affecting the Church should not be transacted entirely by these Houses.

Our historical survey would be more imperfect than it is were it not added that Archbishop Tait discouraged any extension of the activity of Convocation. He preferred that the Church should act through Parliament. It will probably now be generally admitted that the history of the Public Worship Regulation Act—a measure which would never have been passed by the Convocations or have received the assent of a House of Laymen—proves that his opinion was not far-sighted. His successor had very different views. The striking protest of the two Convocations in informal meeting on May 16th, 1893, was a fact of the greatest ecclesiastical (and it may be added political) importance. Archbishop Benson noted the stress which Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Balfour were “disposed to lay on the part of Convocation in legislation”; and during his archiepiscopate two points of constitutional importance

were laid down on the authority of the Lord Chancellor, both strictly in accordance with precedent.

“(1) It is not of necessity that Convocation should be prorogued when Parliament is.

“(2) The Archbishop’s prorogation is recognised in determining the meeting, irrespective of any other document.”

So far of the history of our Convocations. The sketch, brief as it is, may serve to introduce our main question. What does the welfare of the Church demand should be done with regard to these ancient bodies?

First, it is clear that at least some advantage would accrue from the joint action of the two Provinces. The authority of both has in times past been obtained by passing measures in one Convocation, and then sending them on to the other for confirmation, by a representation of the York Houses as delegates in the Canterbury Convocation, or by a meeting of the two Convocations together at one time and place. This last arrangement seems now to have been accepted as the most convenient and the most authoritative.

So long ago as 1878 (February 12th) the Lower House of Canterbury had expressed a wish for a yearly joint meeting “for the double purpose of arriving at a common decision on subjects which have been considered by their respective Convocations, and also of expressing an united opinion on Bills already introduced or about to be introduced into Parliament affecting the condition and welfare of the Church of England.”

In July, 1899, the members of the two Convocations and of the two Houses of Laymen sat as two separate assemblies in the Church House in London, and at a joint meeting of the Convocations of Canterbury and York sitting in committee it was carried almost unanimously—

“That in the interests of the Church it is desirable that a joint meeting of the two Convocations should be held in each year.”

The Houses of Laymen carried resolutions still more clear—

“That in the interests of the Church it is desirable that a joint meeting of the two Convocations should be periodically held, and that power should be given them for that purpose and letters of business be issued for their action as the representative body of the Church of England.

“That it is desirable that the Houses of Laymen should have a more recognised position as consultative bodies of the Church and should meet jointly when the two Convocations do so.

“That it is desirable, in the interests of the Church, that a joint meeting of the two Houses of Laymen should be held from time to time at Westminster.”

Secondly, the general belief in the fullest application of the representative principle has caused a serious attempt to reform the system of representation by which the Lower Houses are at present returned. This system is not uniform. In the Southern Province the deans, archdeacons, one proctor from each cathedral chapter, and two proctors from each diocese, attend: in the Northern the representation of parochial clergy is by two proctors from each archdeaconry. The details of the elections are complicated and of ancient use. In the voting for diocesan proctors, the franchise is enjoyed only by the parochial clergy. Simplicity and a fuller representation have long been desired. In 1893 the late Sub-Dean of Lincoln, Mr. Clements, who was for many years a prominent and most valuable member of the Lower House, stated that since the revived action of Convocation its reform had been considered twenty-five times. The long consideration has ended as follows. After long discussion it was decided by the Convocation of Canterbury to proceed to reform of the system by canon, and the royal assent to prepare a canon having been obtained, the following was approved on January 26th, 1897, by the Upper

House, and by the Lower House on the following day:—

“Whereas throughout this Church and realm the number of parishes and of parochial clergy ministering to the people has greatly increased, whilst no corresponding addition has been made to the number of Proctors of the Clergy called to Convocation from each diocese of the Province;

“It is hereby constituted and ordained that the numbers of Proctors of the Clergy returned from each diocese shall be reckoned according to the archdeaconries, so that there shall be reckoned one Proctor at least for each archdeaconry; but if the number of parochial cures in any archdeaconry exceeds 150, there shall be two Proctors for that archdeaconry; if the number exceeds 225, three Proctors; if it exceeds 300, four Proctors; but no diocese shall return more than seven Proctors. All Proctors, when elected, shall be considered as Proctors for the diocese.”

This canon having been approved, the archbishop applied to obtain the royal assent to it; but no answer was received. This is the usual method by which assent is refused, and it was inferred that the legal advisers of the Crown considered that no reform of Convocation, whether by the archbishop or by the action of Convocation itself, was advisable. On May 11th, 1898, the Lower House resolved to ask for a declaratory Act, at the same time suggesting a form which that Act should take. Two days later the matter was debated in the Upper House, and the following resolution was carried:—

“That this House requests his Grace the President to take such steps as are necessary to give effect to the resolutions agreed to by the Lower House on May 11th, 1898, on the subject of the reform of the representation of the clergy in Convocation.”

So the matter rested for a year. On April 25th, 1899, the Dean of S. Paul's presented a *gravamen* which was on the following day made an *articulus cleri*. It repeated the resolution of May 23rd, 1898, and continued—

“And inasmuch as the Lower House is not aware of the result of any action which may have been taken by the Upper House ; And whereas, during a considerable period of years, there has been a strong dissatisfaction expressed by both Clergy and Laity of the Church of England that the parochial clergy are not represented by an adequate number of Proctors elected by them in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury ; And whereas the Lower House has on many occasions expressed its unanimous desire that the just demand of Clergy and Laity should be granted in order that the resolutions of the Lower House may carry greater weight with Churchmen generally ; And whereas, notwithstanding such representation, it has not as yet been possible either to obtain from the Crown the licence necessary for the enactment of a canon by which such increased representation may be secured or to obtain authority to procure the same result in some other way :

“The Lower House respectfully urges his Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House to press most strongly upon her Majesty’s Government the importance and justice of such a request being granted, and to ask that either letters of business directing the Convocation of the Southern Province to proceed in the drafting of a canon may be issued, or that steps be taken to secure a declaratory Act as soon as possible.”

So the matter now rests.

But it must not be imagined that the action, or rather the abstention, of the Queen’s Ministers so far has been without high ecclesiastical support. It was keenly debated in the Convocations by what means the suggested reform should be carried out. On the one hand it has been asserted that as the royal writ for the convention of a Convocation directs the archbishops to “call together with convenient speed, in lawful manner all and singular the Bishops of your Province and Deans of your Cathedral Churches, and also the Archdeacons, Chapters and Colleges, and the whole Clergy of every Diocese of the same Province,” so the power to alter the present system of representation belongs simply to the archbishop. This

view may be thought to be supported by the writs of summons issued by the archbishops in 1225, 1258, and 1273, from which it may be seen that the presence of elected proctors was not then regarded as essential to a Convocation. The last two vicars-general have given opinion unfavourable to this view. On the other hand, when in 1282 the clergy of the Province of Canterbury expressly protested against the non-representation of the parochial clergy, "the archbishop" (I quote from a speech made by the Bishop of Oxford during the discussion of the subject in February, 1898),

"apparently by his ordinary authority as usual, issued his writ for three weeks after Easter, when, after discussion in diocesan assemblies, the clergy were to elect two proctors from each diocese '*sicut in dictâ congregatione provisum fuerat.*' The importance of the words must not be overrated; but it seems decisive, as it furnishes the form which has been followed in this province ever since, being sometimes, I grant, called and treated as a canon. It is otherwise in the Northern Province, which never claimed to have such a provision by statute or canon, but maintained, by the following of more ancient precedent, and by acceptance of the common law right of the archbishop to summon his clergy in his own way, a practice which seems historically established a few years before this provision at Northampton."

From 1282, then, the system of representation still adopted in the Convocation of Canterbury may be definitely dated. It was not fixed by canon, and our greatest constitutional authority does not believe that the determination of the rules for representation of the clergy in Convocation was ever a matter on which a canon of the Church was passed. The failure of the canon of 1897 to receive the royal assent is thus easily explained.

The other course suggested, that of procuring a declaratory Act recognising the archbishop's power, or the

power of the Houses themselves, to reform the representative system, has the highest sanction. To quote again the same authority :—

“A reformed Convocation must be recognised by Parliament, whether it is founded on canon or anything else, as identical with the historic prescriptive body which for six centuries the nation, through Parliament, has treated as possessing, within varying limitations, certain powers which the law, over which the Crown and the Three Estates exercise supreme control, engages or continues to enforce. So I think on general grounds a parliamentary recognition of any serious modification such as proposed is absolutely necessary. How can it be done? How can it be attempted? Well, it can be done by a short declaratory Act recognising in the reformed Convocation—reformed by the authority of the archbishop, under conditions which might be defined by canon or otherwise—the authority which is recognised in the existing body of Convocation.”

But the question still remains: Is any reform of the representation desirable? The present bodies, it has been declared, have “every element, humanly speaking, of competence and discretion,” and as for the representatives of the parochial clergy “two for each diocese would be as effective as half a dozen.” The Convocation of Canterbury itself, it may be answered, has decided after years of discussion that such reform is necessary. Parliament has reformed itself at its own wish. Why may not Convocation do so? But here, surely, is a legitimate occasion for the exercise of the power of the State. If the State considers that any alteration in the constitution of the bodies which she recognises as the Convocation of the Church of England is undesirable, it would be unwise for Churchmen to resent a perfectly legitimate exercise of her authority.

None the less, it may be added, an increased representation of the clergy in their Convocations could hardly do

harm to the State. Why should it not be granted if it is desired?

Passing from the question of the reform of Convocation to the wider question of the demand for a fuller expression of the corporate action of the Church, it is to be observed that the resolution of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, April 27th, 1899, states clearly and forcibly the need which Churchmen are feeling more strongly every day. It runs as follows:—

“That this House desires to express its opinion that present difficulties in the Church will best be permanently met by finding a fuller expression, consistently with the union between Church and State, for the principle of corporate action in the conduct of Church affairs, and trusts that a larger measure of freedom in the management of her own affairs may be accorded to the Church, acting in and through her duly constituted assemblies, regard being had to the respective responsibilities of Clergy and Laity; and respectfully requests His Grace the President and their Lordships of the Upper House to take such steps with a view to secure these objects as in their wisdom they may think fit.”

The matter thus rests at present with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the episcopate on the one hand, with the authorised representation of the State on the other. It is no business of the writer of this essay to anticipate action or to prophesy results. He prefers to give a very brief answer to the question: What has been the attitude of the State towards Convocation, its powers, and its demands?

The Convocations are only dealt with, I believe, in one of all the thousands of Acts of Parliament, and that is the statute 25 Hen. viii. c. 19, quoted above (p. 146). When William III. endeavoured to pass a Comprehension Bill, as a means of uniting Dissenters to the Church, the House of Commons refused to make any change without the

consent of Convocation ; and on November 21st, 1702, they passed a resolution that they would "on all occasions assert the just rights and privileges of the Lower House of Convocation." But the extension of those rights has always been regarded with extensive jealousy by the Commons. The rights are confined within very strict limits. What those limits are has never been more clearly expressed than by the present Bishop of Ely, when, as Prolocutor of the Lower House, he said, on February 11th, 1881—

"There is a very strong limit [by Act of Parliament] to our power of enacting a canon ; but there is no limit to our right to prefer a request to the Crown for permission to enact one."

And on the same day he added that if the Convocation were to pass a canon they would come under *præmunire*.

"The Act requires that there should be a licence for enacting a canon. The licence is not given except upon the petition of Convocation, and it is never given unless the petition specifies what the canon is to be by stating the words of the canon. Therefore it is absolutely necessary before we could get a licence that we should draft the canon. Hence it is clear that the draft of a canon is a legal act."

Thus, in its power of legislating on matters purely ecclesiastical, the Church is severely tied down. On the other hand, within the narrow limits of their powers, the Convocations have found themselves protected by the State.

The Law Courts have from time to time clearly recognised the rights of the Church assemblies. Lord Coleridge, C.J., when asked to issue a mandamus to compel the Archbishop of York to admit Canon Trevor as a member of the Lower House of the Northern Convocation, said—

"What we are asked to do is to interfere in the internal affairs of an ancient body as old as Parliament, and as independent, to control the action of its President and to revise or reverse his decision on a matter relating to the constitution of the body itself. For 700 or 800 years, it is conceded, no precedent for

such an interference can be found. Such an interference would not only be without a shadow of precedent, but would be inconsistent with the character and constitution of the body with which we are asked to interfere."

These may be adequate descriptions of the constitutional position. Selden, nearly three centuries ago, put the practical result more abruptly when he said—

"We have nothing so nearly expresses the power of a Convocation in respect of a Parliament as a court leet where they have a power to make bye-laws, as they call them; as that a man shall put so many cows or sheep in the common; but they can make nothing that is contrary to the laws of the kingdom."

The analogy to-day might be with a County Council or with some other of the smaller bodies of local authority dear to modern decentralising reformers. But there is this difference. The authority of the Convocations is permitted by the State: it is not delegated. The Church's acts, in her legislative assemblies, owe their validity in the religious sphere to no sanction but a purely spiritual one. Nor can reasonable exception be taken to the general views expressed in two passages from the notable *Letters of John Walter Lea*. The first (p. 179) concerns the question of establishment:—

"I do not believe that the authority of the Church or State in their respective spheres is in any respect increased or diminished by the establishment, non-establishment, or dis-establishment, by the latter supreme authority, of any form of religion whatever. The authority of the former supreme power over its own spiritualities is precisely the same under all conceivable variations of external circumstances. The power of the State over the temporalities of the Church is likewise the same under all conceivable variations of her spiritual condition."

The second (p. 181) is concerned with the limits of the respective jurisdictions of the Church and the State:—

"The notion that anything small or great belonging to the spiritualities of the Church, and *as so belonging*, be it law, or

custom, or judgment, or act of administrative authority, or anything else, can be brought under the jurisdiction of the State so as to gain or lose spiritual validity or character, or obligation, in consequence of any act of the State, is to my mind not so much an impropriety as an absurdity. It postulates the impossible. Establishment makes no difference; disestablishment none. According to the 'Constitution,' the State may make laws for the State even in religious matters, but according to no 'Constitution,' actual or potential, can it make laws 'for the Church' in anything. It may make laws *about* her, to support or endow, to persecute or to rob, to help or to hinder; but *for* her, none."

The main difficulty, then, undoubtedly is that at a time when the work and the interests of the Church have expanded on every side, it is impossible for her to legislate, even on matters of purely spiritual concern, without a sanction which adds in no way to the spiritual validity of her legislative acts. Surely it ought to be possible to free the Church without in the slightest degree imperilling the constitutional supremacy of the State. While I am very far from being one of those "who look upon the Anglican Communion as a Church complete and self-centred in herself, a Church which owes no obligations in regard to doctrine and practice to the rest of Christendom," I do not think that foreign examples will assist us here. The analogy of the Established Kirk of Scotland has been often used, but it does not materially help towards a solution. England has never readily received instruction from Scotland, much though she might have profited by it; and we cannot ignore the special experiences of English history. It would be well for Churchmen rather to formulate their own scheme and to submit it to the consideration of Parliament.

I do not desire to suggest what lines that scheme should take. That should be done by men who have practical acquaintance with the difficulties and failures of the present system. But it seems clear that while

such a scheme need not, it probably would, provide for the power of the Convocations to reform themselves. This reform would be effected after further consideration of the position of the laity. The Houses of Laymen would probably be elected on a new franchise, would have, perhaps, a new relation to the clerical Houses, and would have new powers. It has been said that from the beginning the laity had a large share—a share which has been gradually diminished—in “general Church management; moral discipline; election and approbation of officers; financial provision.” There are many ways of restoring this share of Church suffrage to laymen, and restricting it to communicants. Theoretically, such a view is unassailable; but history shows its results. When the nation desired to secure that every office in its government should be held by *bonâ fide* Churchmen the Test Act was passed, restricting office under the Crown to communicants of the English Church, because honest and pious men thought that no Dissenter would profane the holiest ordinance of religion. The test seemed simple: it was not intended to exclude, but to classify. And, in fact, no other clear or satisfactory test can be discovered. But we all know how it worked. And to-day it would involve the keeping of records which before long would be bound to become pedantic and unedifying. On the other hand, for lay members of a Church assembly an oath, as in Parliament, would naturally be required.

It does not seem that laymen were, as such, ever constituent members of the Synods of the early Church. The fullest security for the supremacy of the State was certainly always preserved, but the decrees of the Church for purely spiritual purposes were passed by purely spiritual persons and had purely spiritual force.

“The authority of the State was from time to time sought to make them laws of the State and efficacious in the coercive

forum of the State ; but of lay authority to make them laws of the Church there is nothing."

Nor is there any reason why this should be changed to-day. Purely spiritual matters belong as clearly to the clergy as military matters to soldiers ; but there are many points on which there is no hard line of division, and here the rights of the laity should be emphasised. A word of warning, however, seems urgently needed when it is proposed to restrict a right.

It is the more unnecessary here to suggest a scheme, because so many have been already suggested. The best, it would seem, is that developed by Mr. Justice Phillimore in his essay on "Legal and Parliamentary Possibilities" in *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, edited by Mr. Gore. This would give to reformed Convocations power to frame "schemes" (subject not only to the present final royal sanction, but also to a provision that the Houses of Parliament should not have prayed the Crown to withhold such sanction), dealing with "all matters of discipline, organisation, administration, and worship" in the Church of England. These schemes, when they had received, after the necessary safeguards, the royal assent, would have the force of law. A caution is added which certainly the Church would accept.

"The fullest protection will be wanted for three external interests : (1) Those who have civil rights in Church property, from the Crown itself down to the holder of a faculty pew ; (2) incumbents of benefices with vested interests, from the bishop to the perpetual curate ; (3) Nonconformists of all kinds."

It is difficult to see why, if these interests are protected and the temporal supremacy of the State be fully secured, the widest power of self-government should not be given in the Church of England.

VI.

Anglican Theology

By W. O. BURROWS, M.A.

OUR national temperament is practical and not speculative, and England is a by-word among the nations for its illogical compromises and shameless lack of system, alike in politics, in education, and in philosophy. We are reckoned a "nation of shopkeepers," destitute of ideas. And in truth we mistrust all lofty aims and schemes and phrases. We dislike logical completeness. We mock at "paper constitutions." "Right in theory, wrong in practice," is a popular saying among us, and is used not to express the sad result of experience, but (in contradiction with itself) as the plain man's *theory* of the world; that is what he expects to find, and content with this one theory he scorns all others, except perchance those of his own making. And in consequence he is often the illustration of his own adage, wrong in theory, and yet right in practice.

But even England cannot after all get on without ideas and principles, and we have, and have always had, our thinkers. Only their education, their aims, their methods, have been governed by the national characteristics. They have not been trained to philosophise; like Darwin, they devise their own methods as they go. They may be almost said to live from hand to mouth, for they start with no

idea of working out some all-embracing scheme, but follow the suggestions of the moment as they chance to arise. They are like pilots, who never look up to the stars, but are content to avoid the rocks and shoals that lie close to hand, and to make full use of the currents. And somehow they reach the port. After all, English statesmen and men of letters and naturalists do make their contribution to the progress of the world of thought and knowledge. It must be very provoking to the others when their magnificent schemes fail, and the English method or want of method succeeds. A garden thus left to run wild ought to produce only weeds and thorns, but sometimes it has the best flowers and fruit to show. And lookers-on can only offer their sympathy to the scientific gardeners.

As in other matters, so in theology. "Like people, like priest." We English are constitutionally averse to speculative thought. We are determined not to "exercise ourselves in great matters which are too high for us." We are always contrasting dogma and charity, orthodoxy and holiness, till we can hardly believe that a profound theologian can be a man of practical benevolence and have a tender, affectionate heart. What English artist, for instance, would ever have thought of painting S. Jerome with a tame lion and a tame partridge? And with these prejudices against abstract thought, it is no wonder that we create no systems of theology. The very idea seems ridiculous to us; we claim to have received a revelation, and we have no wish to invent anything new. We have therefore no Tübingen, no Ritschl. We have no schools of thought in divinity. At best we have a "movement," and what a dull, sordid, uninspiring word it is! Such is our present barrenness in speculative theology; and if we look back to the period of the Reformation we find there the same phenomenon. While "vast scientific systems of theology, like the great work of Suarez, unfolded and established

with philosophic calmness and strength the Roman doctrine," while the genius of Calvin elaborated a creed "stern, hard, positive, but thoroughly earnest and very mighty, and with a gloomy and savage grandeur and nobility, in its passionate, loyal assertions of the irresistible sovereignty of God, against the claims, the worthlessness, and the insignificance of man,"* what had England to show? A Church that put the Bible in her children's hands, and read it to them systematically from cover to cover, and taught them to read it for themselves. A Prayer-book rich in the inheritance of ages of devotion, and yet at every point explaining itself to the ignorant, sanctifying the trivial round, the common task, and following every crisis in life with divine sympathy, with its

"Touches of things common,
Till they rose to touch the spheres."

Sacraments and ministry that had lost none of the power of Christ's institution in being purged of mediæval abuses. Altogether an excellent outfit for all pastoral and practical purposes. But for abstract theology we had nothing to show but a makeshift collection of some thirty-nine Articles, dealing cursorily with most of the points at that time in dispute. And yet somehow or other good work has been done and is being done by English students and thinkers. And while in some quarters the mere mention of Anglican theology would raise a laugh, after all there is such a thing, and it has its own peculiar merits.

This distaste for speculation has not always characterised English thought. In the fourteenth century Oxford was coupled with Paris as a chief seat of the metaphysical philosophy of the Schoolmen. We had our Roger Bacon, our Alexander of Hales, our William of

* Dean CHURCH's Lecture on "Bishop Andrewes," in *Masters in English Theology*, pp. 85, 95.

Ockham, and, if we may claim him too, Duns, the great "Scotchman." But those were in the Middle Ages, and for whatever reason things have been very different in English thought since the revival of learning and the development of natural science and the invention of printing, since the discovery of America and the beginnings of colonisation, since the great religious upheavals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. And just as the characteristic feature of the Reformation in England was the absence of great men, for we had no Luther, no Calvin, no Ignatius Loyola, not even a John Knox; so it has been the characteristic of Anglican theology ever since, that it has been humble, tentative, and if you will, timid; but for those very reasons more faithful, more truthful, more liberal, than the bolder systems of Scotland and of the Continent, which at first sight claim so much more distinguished a place. "Englishmen have always preferred the recognition of all the facts of any case, however irreconcilable they may seem, to the sacrifices which a perfect logical system invariably demands before it can square to its required limits the complex variety of nature and human life."* It is no doubt in consequence of this halting, nebulous indefiniteness of English theological thought, and the absence of great writers of world-wide fame, that our Church has so long been reckoned by continental writers among the Calvinistic bodies. Möhler, for instance, in his *Symbolik*, where he compares the tenets of various bodies of Christians, seems to show no consciousness of a distinctively Anglican position, neither Lutheran nor Calvinistic. To him our theology is but Calvinism and water.

It is not within the scope of this essay to lay down the fundamental truths of Christianity, or even to set forth the teaching of our Church on points of dispute,

* *Masters in English Theology*, Introduction, p. xvi., by Bishop BARRY.

such as the Sacraments and the Ministry. There are books enough on these subjects, whether commentaries on the Creeds and on the Thirty-nine Articles, or independent ventures on various portions, or on the whole Faith of the Gospel. Our concern is a humbler one; we wish only to describe the characteristic tone and temper of the best Anglican writers, the moral and intellectual features which distinguish their work.

For this purpose we may take Hooker and Butler as typical of the great divines of the English Church. They lived a century and a half apart, one under Elizabeth, the other under George II.; the one the contemporary of Shakespeare, Spenser, and Bacon, the other of Walpole and Chatham and the Wesleys. They deal with very different questions, for one is defending the Church of England against the Puritans, the other Christianity against the Deists. But in spite of such great contrasts in outward circumstances, how closely akin are their temperaments and methods, and how characteristic of English theologians! Both were bred at the University, but neither has stayed there for long, and it is as country clergymen in charge of parishes that they think and write. Again, they both contend as controversialists; there is strife, and truth is at bay, and they come to her rescue. Yet their temper is exactly the opposite of controversial; there are no personal attacks, no captious *argumenta ad hominem*, the references to "witty Mr. Cartwright" are as a rule relegated to his footnotes by Hooker, while Butler scarcely mentions his opponents. Each meets his adversary on his own ground, and debates with him there, taking advantage of all that he will concede to him as agreed upon by both sides. But both rise above the conflicts of their day to handle the broad principles of reason and religion, of God's government of the world, and of the great facts of life and history and revelation.

They contend for truth, not for victory, for moral righteousness and serious religion, not to score a triumph or to gain a reputation. Like St. Paul's epistles, their writings are aimed at the errors of the moment, but for that reason are all the more rich as storehouses of truth for later generations. Practical needs produced admirable theories.

But the kinship between the two writers lies much deeper than all this. We may point out the features they both possess, which have further been constantly reproduced in their followers down to Church and Hort.

I.

Reserve. They do not handle every topic that comes in their way. They restrain themselves, and pass a great deal by in silence. They prefer to adore rather than to explain. They recognise the inadequacy of human reason to grasp the system of the government of the universe, or to see God's acts and decisions from God's point of view. Take for example the passage in the *Analogy* about the possible immortality of animals.* There is no expression of the author's own opinion on the subject, still less any attempt to bring others to a particular view, or a condemnation of contrary opinion. Butler confines himself to two points: the first, that we do not know enough to forecast the future of the brute creation with any such confidence as would warrant us in arguing from it; and the second, that if we did know what death means to them, it could afford no presumption against there being a future life for men. That is to say, Butler in the course of his argument is met with a prejudice, which rests on no real foundation, and which he therefore sets to work to remove. And he is content

* Part i., chapter i.

when thirty lines of reasoning have enabled him to pronounce that "except to such as are weak enough to think they are acquainted with the whole system of things, there is absolutely nothing at all in this objection." But what a field for speculative assertion or denial he has thereby refused to enter! He has the self-restraint of an advocate or a diplomatist, who realises that to say too much is even a worse fault than to say too little.

Or we turn to Hooker's epigrammatic summary of heretical speculations. "It is not in man's ability either to express perfectly or to conceive the manner how it (the Incarnation) was brought to pass. But the strength of our faith is tried by those things wherein our wits and capacities are not strong. Howbeit, because this divine mystery is more true than plain, divers having framed the same to their own conceits and fancies, are found in their expositions thereof more plain than true."* Here, again, is the characteristic dislike of adventure in theological metaphysics, and we are reminded that in truth there is such a thing as true Christian agnosticism, for we do not profess to "know all mysteries and all knowledge" or to hold the key to every problem. But Christians have too often forgotten that as yet we only see "in a mirror, darkly," and need the wholesome reserve and humility of Hooker and Butler.

We find only a slight change of position when we turn to Hooker's famous Eirenikon about the Real Presence in the Eucharist, wherein he urges all parties to put aside metaphysical subtleties, whether on the one side or the other, and to come to the Lord's Table, not full of argument, but of love and spiritual desire. "The one because they enjoyed not disputed, the other disputed not because they enjoyed."† The spiritual feast is worth more than any intellectual knowledge of mysteries.

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 52, 1.

† *Ibid.*, v. 67, 3.

We see the same characteristic reserve in the formulæ of the Anglican Church. Thus in the Thirty-nine Articles she is careful not to venture beyond the lines laid down by Scripture and primitive teaching. On predestination, for instance, she keeps so close to Bible language as to be fairly charged with having said a great deal without elucidating the matter; so that both Calvinist and Arminian claim the 17th Article, as they claim Scripture, to be on their side. Again, we have no statement as to the present condition of the dead, only a condemnation of the mediæval views about Purgatory, together with a prayer in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick for the purging of the soul of the dying man. We have no definition of the mode of the Lord's presence in the Eucharist, and, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has recently told us, more than one view can claim to be legitimately held within the Church of England. Scripture has not discussed the metaphysics of the question, and therefore the Church of England is equally silent and reserved. Once more, she lays down her own rules about Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, Ordination: she offers these means of grace, she exacts certain conditions in those who come to them, and in God's name she promises to those who in all sincerity comply with those conditions real spiritual benefit through these ordinances. But she nowhere takes upon herself to say what may or may not be the consequences of following other, less scriptural, less Catholic systems; what loss may be incurred by those who die unbaptized or let their children so die; by those who neglect Confirmation; or by those who receive only in one kind and never enjoy the communion of the Blood of Christ. She has never expressed any decision as to the incapacitating effect of the lack of episcopal Ordination or of a break in the succession of Bishops. For herself and her own children she is clear and precise, but she utters no rash judgment of

others, no presumptuous anticipation either of God's indifference to such defects or of His condemnation of them. She maintains the studied reserve of one who declares the message that came from God, but for very loyalty dare not go beyond that message.

II.

A constant recurrence to first principles. As Antæus gained new strength whenever he touched Mother Earth, so the English theologian will not go far without once more looking to his foundations, and satisfying himself that the upgrowth is rooted deeply and securely. He does not set out to build "a tower whose top may reach unto heaven and make him a name": he is content to walk on lower levels, if so he may keep closer to that which is solid, trustworthy, fundamental. Back to the Hebrew or to the Greek. The English Church has no belief in an inspired Vulgate or an infallible Authorised Version. Back to the Gospels, back to the Creeds. Our writers refuse to start where their predecessors left off without going over again the whole course of their arguments. We have no system of appealing to received opinions or the majority of recognised authorities, except as a makeshift, till the question can be thought out again from the start. It is not the rule with us voluminously to enumerate all the possible and impossible opinions of all previous commentators or critics, and then to count heads as if the majority must be right, or to argue and dispute till the main point is covered over with rubbish. If a catena of authorities is given, it is for a historical purpose, to exhibit the development of thought on the subject. Scripture, and not received opinion, is the final test of truth. Of all ancient writers Vincent of Lerins most clearly expresses the position of the English Church, and to his famous canon we

adhere: "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus." Only it is sometimes necessary to remind even Anglicans that the word "always" stands side by side with "everywhere," and no amount of general consent in later ages can prove a doctrine to have been part of the original deposit of the truth, unless it can be shown to have been held from the beginning. If it is really Catholic it must also be primitive; if it is to have the authority of the Church it must have been held "always."

Back, then, to the originals. Some of the best work done in England in this generation is to be found in our excellent commentaries, and in the originality of English investigations into the text of the New Testament. Back to first principles. See how Hooker starts with the nature of law and government, and gradually concentrates his flight, till at last he swoops down on the Puritan with his fantastic objections to the surplice and the use of versicles and responses. Or to take an example from another of our great divines. See how Jeremy Taylor, in *A Dissuasive from Popery*, at the outset of his attack, distinguishes the authority of Scripture from that of subsequent teachers, however saintly or learned.

"We do easily acknowledge that to dispute these questions from the sayings of the fathers, is not the readiest way to make an end of them; but, therefore, we do wholly rely upon Scripture, as the foundation and final resort of all our persuasions, and from thence can never be confuted; but we also admit the fathers as admirable helps for the understanding of the Scriptures, and as good testimony of the doctrine delivered from their forefathers down to them, of what the Church esteemed the way of salvation: and, therefore, if we find any doctrine now taught, which was not placed in their way of salvation, we reject it as being no part of the Christian faith, and which ought not to be imposed upon consciences. They were 'wise unto salvation,' and 'fully instructed to every good

work,' and, therefore, the faith, which they professed and derived from Scripture, we profess also ; and in the same faith we hope to be saved even as they. But for the new doctors, we understand them not, we know them not : our faith is the same from the beginning and cannot become new."

In all our chief writers we find this appeal to what is primary and fundamental, this independent criticism both of what is traditional and of what is novel. They mistrust the last new importation from Rome or from Germany ; yet they hold themselves free to question, and if need be reject, what has behind it the most august record of general acceptance. Things old and new must alike be brought to the test of an appeal to the solid elementary foundations of our religion.*

III.

Closely allied to this fidelity to first principles is the Anglican *fidelity to the evidence*, to the whole of the evidence. It is, no doubt, impossible to start without categories of thought and presuppositions of various kinds. And what Bacon called *idola specus*, individual tendencies to this or that line of thought, exert their influence even when the writer least suspects it. We might even go further, and say that they are apt to be most pernicious just when all consciousness of them is most loudly repudiated. But at any rate an English writer makes some effort to get rid of them, and to admit the full force of

* This position is quite compatible with the recognition of the historic facts, that the Church existed before any of the New Testament was written, and herself determined the Canon of authoritative Scripture, so that, as we receive the Old Testament from our Lord, and use it because He used it, in the same way we receive the New Testament from the Church. (See Dr. Sanday's *Bampton Lectures*, Lecture I.) And it is equally consonant with a belief in the teaching office of the Church : she is to be ever learning, ever teaching. But her charter is the faith once for all delivered ; and we can admit no "developments," except such as faithfully unfold that which was really there already. Cf. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonitorium*, c. xxiii.

the evidence. Theories, we acknowledge, must be squared to facts, and not facts to theories. We applaud Bacon's scorn for the Schoolmen, who, like spiders spinning webs out of their own bodies, evolved scientific principles out of their inner consciousness, and dictated to Nature what she ought to do, instead of humbly finding out what she did do. And our theologians treat the Scriptures and the Fathers, for example, with the same respect which Bacon claimed for Nature: they do not put into their mouths the things they imagine they ought to have said. They do not wilfully use corrupt or interpolated texts, or gloss over unwelcome passages. Nor again are they the victims of that lust for originality which makes it impossible for an author to agree with his predecessors. What does the evidence warrant us in asserting? What does it make probable, possible, impossible? The result of such questions may be dull and stale, or it may upset long cherished beliefs and be inconvenient in its practical bearings; but at any rate it is likely to be true to facts.

IV.

And fourthly, the inevitable outcome of such principles is a tendency to what enemies call compromise, and kindlier critics *breadth of view*. And in truth the motive of the Anglican Via Media is not time-serving or expediency, but honest anxiety to include the whole truth and to ignore no genuine aspect of the case. Such width of thought is of course inconsistent with theoretical neatness, with sweeping generalisation, with absolute negatives. Facts are not logical, and the English mind prefers facts. And thus the Anglican position commends itself to thoughtful men not as logically systematic, nor on the other hand as a politic compromise, but as more faithful to revelation and to history than the falsehood of either extreme.

It is true that in teaching the young, and in the first ventures of discovery, you must ignore exceptions and assume uniformities that do not really exist: your points must be without magnitude, your lines without breadth, your billiard balls perfectly smooth and elastic. It is only at a later stage that the pupil can study infinitesimals and approximations. And very likely Anglican theology may sometimes be too quick in its return to hard facts and compromise, instead of venturing a little more into abstract theory first. But after all, as Butler insisted, religion is a practical subject;* and though Plato philosophises well, it is pious to hold truth yet more dear.

The history of recent Biblical criticism affords a good illustration of these characteristics of Anglican theology. Very little of startling novelty has come from England. It is the French and the Germans who start the hares, and set them galloping for a space far ahead of the plodding English beagles; but at last they are run down, and then the dogs have the best of it. Only the fittest escape and live. We did, it is true, have our Colenso, but he found the environment (to put it mildly) uncongenial. But on the other hand, for we must be silent concerning the living, consider Lightfoot's work in the Ignatian controversy and in his answer to *Supernatural Religion*. He has an open mind: the new theories have come; let us give them a fair chance; will they be able to hold their own? We must keep our heads; religion itself is not at stake. Neither Christianity nor our Anglican position will become untenable, though it should

* *Analogy*, I. vi. Butler is rebutting the argument against religion, which was based upon a fatalistic "opinion of necessity." He avoids the metaphysical discussion of the topic, and is content to show that the notion of necessity is not applicable to practical subjects. But incidentally he points out that this line of argument does not contain any reflection upon reason, for reason bids us act upon practical principles, and convinces us that in these matters speculations cannot be depended upon.

appear that even the "middle recension" of the Ignatian letters is largely composed of interpolations, for we have long known that of the "longer recension." We shall still be able to say the Creed, even if St. John did not write the Fourth Gospel: for after all we have never known who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. And once more, to leave Lightfoot for a moment, we shall not like Marcion reject the whole Old Testament, or like Robert Elsmere throw up our Orders, if it turns out that Moses did not write Deuteronomy, or Daniel the book of Daniel; for after all we have never known who wrote the Psalms. And so in perfect sobriety of judgment and openness of mind, the questions are discussed by Lightfoot; vast treasures of learning are brought to bear, history and science are ransacked to explain any difficulties; and at last the issue comes out which from the first we in our heart of hearts suspected, the new views are wrong and the old ones right after all. Two presuppositions have indeed underlain the whole discussion, but they have been resolutely kept in check: one, that there is a presumption in favour of the traditional view, and the other, that when we have got the truth there will still remain difficulties, probably insoluble difficulties.

M. Boissier, in beginning his brilliant essay on Cicero, points out that the Germans, and we may add to them the whole class of young men, have been hard on the great orator from their lack of experience in national self-government, in the give-and-take of parliamentary politics. And he claims, and in his case at any rate the claim is justified, that the French know better how to make allowances for the difficulties of the political situation. Something of the same kind is true with regard to our subject. English writers approach theological questions from the midst of a very different experience from that of a pro-

fessor in a German university or a lecturer in a Romish seminary. They have been guided and moulded by the English Prayer-book, with its constant recital of God's Word, its emphasis on human weakness, its "sober standard of feeling," its "soothing tendency,"* its sympathy with high and low, rich and poor. And they have spent half the week-day in visiting the sick and preparing candidates for confirmation; half Sunday, perhaps, in teaching school-children. These influences reach into the study, and leave their mark on all that issues thence, sobering, chastening, uplifting the scholar's work.

But what an extraordinary system it seems if you set yourself to look for encouragements for theological research and speculative independence. Hooker is a parish priest. Butler is "buried" in a Durham village, where they only remembered that he rode a black pony very fast, and yielded to importunate beggars. Year by year an effort is made in the Church of England to produce a new theological treatise; but by the conditions of the trust the Bampton lectures must be delivered as sermons from the University pulpit. When Butler and Lightfoot have obtained fame, among philosophers and historians, they must, forsooth, be appointed to bishoprics, and excellent bishops they made. Our theological professors are compelled to lecture to crowds of young men, who are obliged to attend if not to listen. Truly an extraordinary system, such as no one could have devised, and no one attempt to reproduce.

And yet it answers. It answers not only for the parishes, the undergraduates, the dioceses, but also for the thinkers and students of theology. The Anglican divines always speak and write under the stress of a grave sense of responsibility in teaching. They must not advance wild theories, lest they seriously mislead their pupils. They must not be partisan or needlessly controversial, lest by

* KEBLE, Preface to the *Christian Year*.

kindling wrath and bitterness they thereby injure souls. They must be frank and open and just, for they speak in a critical atmosphere where any falsity will be detected and exposed. They are not secluded in the delusive safety of a seminary, nor are they merely athletes stripping for a public contest that has no importance beyond the victory of the moment. They have always felt themselves—and this is the chief characteristic of the Anglican writers on sacred subjects—the servants of the most ignorant as well as of the most learned, advocates of practical religion as well as pioneers in abstract theology.

VII.

Anglican Worship

By W. O. BURROWS, M.A.

IT is the fashion in some quarters to disparage our Prayer-book, and especially to sneer at that time-honoured phrase, "our incomparable liturgy." And no doubt there is some justice in the mockery; for Anglicans have not commonly had much knowledge of the service-books of other countries, so as to compare them justly with our own, and in this as in other matters have been insular and prejudiced. And, moreover, we are biassed in our judgment not only by a somewhat jealous and ignorant patriotism, but by the nobler influence of inherited tradition. Most men, however radical in politics, or revolutionary in social questions, have a tendency in religion to be stiffly conservative. The services and the prayers, the rites and the ceremonies, that we knew as children are to many of us throughout life the standard of perfection. This fidelity to what is familiar has its good side, as it has its bad side; and it is not merely due to unreasoning prejudice, but has its roots deep down in human nature. For what we revered before we understood it has, if it is at all worthy in itself, much more than the glamour of old and dear association. It is not to be compared merely to the table that we love because we played on it and under it as children; but, rather, it is

like the scenery of our childish home, the same, yet always changing; it is like the face of one whom we have long known and loved. For as the years go by, we are always finding out new meanings in that which is yet so old and familiar; and the delight of the discovery enhances our joy in the sympathy thus freshly discerned. Among all men, that which only gradually discloses its truth, its beauty, its kindliness, its appropriateness, is the more highly prized by reason of that reserve and delay. "Valent ænigmatum latebræ ad amorem veritatis acuedum."* And so it has been for many of us with our English service and Prayer-book. We loved them before we understood them, and as we grow in knowledge of them we love them all the more. And therefore it is almost impossible for us to estimate rightly the merits and defects of other forms of service; and we rashly consider that the best to which we are most accustomed.

Although then the word "incomparable" is better left out, because in truth we are not in a position to compare our liturgy fairly with others, we may still be allowed to substitute some other word of praise, and to thank God for the deep influence our Prayer-book has had on the religious character of England. That influence is more subtle and profound than is at once realised; and it is more widespread. It is not only that Wesleyans and others constantly and openly use the Prayer-book Collects, or wisely borrow its phraseology in their own compositions. But beyond this the steadfast standard of orthodoxy, earnestness, sincerity, and penitence, set up by the Church of England, and maintained by daily use of the Prayer-book, has told far and wide among English-speaking peoples. If the Creeds, for example, had not been so well known and so often recited, there is little doubt but that popular divergence from the true faith would have

* S. AUGUSTINE, *De cat. rud.* ix.

been much wider than it is. Again, though people rebel at the reiteration of the "State Prayers," which have now been a feature in English services for about a thousand years, yet they are an effectual witness to the duty taught in Scripture of consecrating politics, and taking national life religiously. Once more, the Church's recurrent invitations to repentance and confession of sins have probably gone far to check our national heresy of Pelagian self-complacency. For while Puritanism encourages confident assertions of sinlessness (since conversion), and while religious men are constantly tempted to adopt the pharisaic conviction "we are the people, and wisdom shall die with us," and not only wisdom, but virtue and godliness too, the Prayer-book calls on us to ask repeatedly year by year for new and contrite hearts, and bids us acknowledge that we have erred and strayed from God's ways like lost sheep.

The principles of the Prayer-book services are laid down in those admirable, but too rarely read Prefaces, which stand in the forefront of the book. Sometimes a tedious anthem or an inaudible sermon sends us in despair on a voyage of discovery in the unexplored regions of the Prayer-book; and if we have the wisdom to turn to the first pages, we probably end by feeling grateful to the cause that without meaning it did us so good a service. It is to be hoped that these opportunities occur less often than they did of yore; but at any rate it will be worth while to attempt to restate and illustrate these fundamental principles of our public worship, which also in great measure are applicable to our private devotions.

I.

The Priesthood of the Laity. The most obvious of the changes made at the Reformation was the translation of the services into English. Here, as elsewhere, our

Church reverted to Scripture and to primitive custom; here, as elsewhere, she found herself in sympathy with the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, which has always encouraged the use of the vernacular.* But beneath the obvious outward change lay a vital principle. It was not only that St. Paul† expressly demands that the unlearned shall be able to follow and assent to what the conductor of the service is saying, and forbids speaking in an (unknown) tongue unless there be one to interpret. It was not only that the Greek version of the Old Testament was far more widely used by the Fathers than the Hebrew original, or that both Testaments, Old and New, were already translated into Latin and Syriac in the second century; not only that the Church of Rome itself spoke Greek at first because her members were largely non-Italian, or that she at a later date adopted Latin merely because it was then the vernacular. Good as these arguments are, it is possible somewhat to weaken their force by the contention that the gift of tongues of which St. Paul was speaking has died out; that people easily learn enough Latin to follow the service while their ears are helped out by their eyes; and that in an age of travel and emigration what is most needed is a world-wide language, and that Latin is still on the whole the best available. But to adopt such a line of defence is to concede that which was really at stake in the sixteenth century. For it was not a question of convenience, but of principle, of a principle that lies at the very root of the Christian system. The service must be *congregational*. Not in order that it may be attractive, though that is, of course, desirable. Not in the sense that there may be no pauses for silence, no "solos" (so

* It is said that in Alaska the Greek services are conducted in English. On the Anglican position see the twenty-fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

† 1 Cor. xiv.

to speak) in praying or singing. But the point is that the service is the act of the Church. Its very name of "public worship" implies it. The body, the Church, is there to worship. She is a Priesthood, a worshipping Society, and this is her chief corporate act. Certainly she has also to preach the Gospel and do good works, sanctifying all nations and all parts of life. But the outcome of her life and work is to be universal, unhampered, consentient worship. And meanwhile her meetings are first and foremost for worship, for congregational worship, all members of the body combining to exercise their priesthood. Thus although God has given some apostles and some prophets, and has appointed pastors and ministers in the Church, yet it is not His intention that they alone should do the work of worship, and the rest act only by proxy and be excused. Better no doubt that the parson should pray alone than that no one should pray at all. But that is not the ideal. The praying parson should mean a praying people. And so the Church of England in her Prayer-book deliberately aims at congregational worship, each man, woman, and child taking his part. And therefore, in the first place, the service must be in the mother tongue of the people; next it must be plain and easy to understand; and, thirdly, it must call out men's co-operation by demanding audible responses, and combined changes of bodily posture, as we stand or kneel all together.

Of course, a society must have leaders, and to His Society God has given the leaders; they are divinely appointed and commissioned to lead. But their office is to help the others to pray and praise as a united body. As with the army, so with the Church. The army does not consist of officers, neither does the Church; nor, on the other hand, do the rank and file in either case appoint

and authorise the officers. The officers are commissioned from above, but they exist only to lead the troops, in order that the whole may act together. Without the laity the clergy lose the chief part of their functions and of their efficiency.

There are then two chief dangers to be dreaded: the clergy may magnify their office out of all proportion, and the laity may slothfully refuse to do their part. Against the former danger the Church of England is careful to invite all to join in every act of worship: all prayers and intercessions are to be uttered aloud, and the people to say Amen. The Prayer-book provides no special offices for the clergy as such, it only requires of them the regular and diligent recital of the common services, to which they are further bound to invite who will and can to come. The chief mediæval abuse as regards the congregational aspect of worship had been "solitary masses" said by the priest alone, often with no one else present at all. These are absolutely prohibited in the Prayer-book. There is to be no celebration unless there are a convenient (*i.e.*, suitable) number to communicate with the priest,* and when the English Church is stretching her charity to the utmost to meet a case of dire need in a plague-stricken district, she still provides that there must be at least the sick man and the priest to join together in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.†

We find another illustration of the same principle in the plan and arrangement of our buildings. All members of the Church are to come boldly to the throne of grace.

* Third Rubric at the end of the Order of the Ministration of the Holy Communion.

† See the several Rubrics of the Communion of the Sick. It is not our concern here to discuss whether or how far the old danger has died out, so that these rules might be wisely relaxed to meet the needs of our teeming city populations. We are only speaking of the English Prayer-book as it stands.

All are in Christ Jesus, and are what He is, priests. We do not, therefore, sever the laity from the clergy. Whatever may be the historical explanation of the fact, we do not as a rule shut off one part of the Church from another. We have no iconostasis as the Greeks have, screening the altar from the gaze of the congregation. And if for practical convenience we divide choir and nave, yet it is usual for laymen and boys to sit even nearer to the altar than do the priests. And in the great central act of communion all come up to the sanctuary to receive the holy things into their very hands* as consecrated priests of God.

In such ways do we in England insist on the congregational character of public worship, and make prominent the truth that worship is the act of the whole body and not only that of certain organs in the body. Not that other bodies of Christians would deny this principle, but none express it so clearly as the English Church. On the one side the priest and people for the most part worship separately, though often in the same building and at the same time. And, on the other side, worship is but a small element in the service, and if the prayers are not (as has been averred) addressed to the people rather than to God, yet the larger part of the service is just that which most sharply divides the minister from the congregation—the sermon. It is in the English Church that we find the best examples of corporate worship, in the united recital of the Creeds, in the *Te Deum* and *Gloria in excelsis*, and, above all, in the people's Communion administered according to the Prayer-book.

* The rubrical direction "into their hands" has a special significance, which has been recently emphasized by the Revised Version; for the Hebrew phrase for consecrating a priest is to "fill the hands," that is to say, the holy things which no layman might touch were solemnly given to him. And so with us, all baptized and confirmed members of the Church are priests, for all have "their hands filled." See marginal note on Exod. xxviii. 41; see also xxix. 24, 33.

But the Church has in this matter a second danger to guard against, besides that of over-emphasizing the part taken by her Ministry. The natural indolence of man prefers to be governed rather than to govern, and to listen to sermons rather than to lift up the heart to God in worship and meditation. Moreover, the layman's shrinking from spiritual effort is apt to present itself as a reasonable example of the principle of division of labour. And so the people are glad to leave to the clergy far more than their right share of the duties of praying and teaching, of administering alms, and carrying on good works. But the Church of England is not content that it should be so. At any rate, in public worship she demands a great deal of the congregation: they have to stand, sit, or kneel to order, to respond to the versicles and glorias, to read half the Psalms, or may be sing the whole of them. And that which makes a greater demand on spiritual imagination and sympathy, they have to rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with them that weep, according as the Prayer-book appoints psalms of thanksgiving or of penitence. In fact, a service for the people is not according to the mind of the English Church, unless it is also in large measure a service carried out by the people. The end and object is the glory of God; and the Church would have all her children, lay as well as cleric, lift up their hearts and their voices in united praise and prayer. Only when she is teaching, only when the time has come for lessons or sermon, does she bid the people listen in silence. Moreover, lest they should find it hard to join in with prayers whose drift might not be obvious at once, she allows no *ex tempore* compositions; all is provided beforehand, all may be read over and studied in the book, so that even the child may be taught to take his part in the worship of the Church. That is our aim; and yet as a matter of fact people often complain that

they cannot follow the Prayer-book services. Ought we not then, laity as well as clergy, parents as well as priests, to take more pains to teach the young and the inexperienced how to find Psalms and Collect? Ought we not to explain with more diligent care the few archaic expressions which may be a hindrance to intelligent congregational worship? We have a great inheritance, but we are dull and slow to realise its value.

And we may reflect in passing that it was in part for this very purpose of helping the congregation to take a real share in the service that the old forms were at the Reformation shortened and condensed, so that the "Divine Service" could be said daily in two short services, and the whole set of prayers and psalms could be bound together in a single volume, and be bought at trifling cost by those who could read. It was with this intention that many ceremonies were abolished, especially those that were "dark" and "dumb,"* that is to say, such as did not readily convey their meaning to the uninstructed; for this purpose that the numerous exhortations were inserted to explain the services to the people; and lastly, that order was taken that one use should prevail throughout England,† so that when men changed their homes they might still find public worship the same, and be able to sing the Lord's songs even in a strange land.

This emphasis, then, on the duties and privileges of the congregation is, broadly speaking, characteristic of the worship of the Church of England. Not, of course, that it is equally attained in all her parishes and cathedrals, nor that it is wholly lacking in the services of other bodies. The Society of Friends has in theory no ministers at all;

* See the Book of Common Prayer, "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained."

† The movement in this direction, however, began before what is commonly called the Reformation, and since that period has been on the Continent one of the objects successfully pursued by the Ultramontanes.

the Independents in theory no permanent, lifelong ministry. The prayer-meeting gives those who are not recognised officers the opportunity of leading the devotions of others. Nearly all Christians delight in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. And lastly, among the Romans, much more is understood by the people than is generally assumed in England, and considerable parts of the services are often rendered in the vernacular. But nevertheless it is in the Church of England above all that the people are bidden to claim their share in all that is going on, and view it as their act; that they are invited to come and join in every service, while to some their presence is even necessary, and that when they are there, except during sermons and anthems, they are never left to be silent for five minutes together, but are always being called upon to sing, to respond, or at least say Amen.

And this feature of our forms of service represents a doctrinal conviction, the importance, namely, of that which is loosely called the priesthood of the laity, but is more exactly described as the priesthood of the whole Church, clergy and laity alike.

But one word more must be added in this section of our subject. For in theological discussions statements are so constantly misunderstood that it is almost always necessary not merely to express oneself guardedly, but also to point out the counterbalancing truths. It is prudent, then, to add that the Church of England, though thus emphasizing the share of the unordained members of the congregation in public worship, is no less clear in laying it down that no one is to preach* or administer the sacraments unless lawfully called and sent;† and in recognising none as lawful

* That is to say, in the public pulpits of the Church in consecrated buildings, where the preacher speaks with some degree of authority *ex officio* as the mouthpiece of the Church. Is it necessary to add that to speak with authority is not the same thing as being infallible?

† See the twenty-third of the Thirty-nine Articles.

ministers unless they have been ordained by a Bishop.* And she has three orders of ministers, which she rightly believes to have come down to us "from the Apostles' time."† Lastly, each of these orders has its prescribed functions and authority; the Deacon, for example, though ordained, is commissioned to baptize infants only, and not adults, to assist the Priest in Holy Communion, but not to consecrate the elements; and he may not preach unless he receives a special licence to that effect, a licence which is now usually but not invariably given.‡

II.

The public worship of the Church of England is in a peculiar degree *Scriptural*. There is no other branch of the Church of Christ where the Scriptures are so constantly and systematically read aloud, the whole New Testament twice a year,§ and by far the larger part of the Old Testament once a year. Something like this had been the intention of the old service-books, as Cranmer reminds us in his preface "Concerning the Service of the Church"; but in various ways they had failed to carry it out, so that "commonly when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread." And so the reform of the Lectionary, which made possible the systematic reading of the Bible from end to end, was put in the very forefront of the list of changes made in divine service. It was the intention of the

* See the preface to "The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons according to the Order of the Church of England."

† That this statement, made in the above preface, is historically justified, see preface to the sixth edition of LIGHTFOOT's *Commentary on the Philip-
pians*.

‡ See "The Form and Manner of Making of Deacons."

§ The only exception is the Book of the Revelation, which was not read at all in the daily course till 1871, and since then is only read once a year.

reformers that the people (not the clergy only) "by daily hearing of the Holy Scripture read in the church might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true Religion."

But we have to consider not only the Lessons, but the Psalms. And where else will you find such knowledge of the Psalms as among regular church-goers in England? The Romans know the seven penitential Psalms and a few others very well. The Nonconformists have their favourites and value them highly. But among neither is there anything like the Anglican rules, which secure that if a person only goes regularly to church twice every Sunday (to say nothing of the week-day services) he will hear the whole book of Psalms very nearly twice through in the year.

And in this matter the Book of Common Prayer has acted very directly on private devotion. Numbers of churchmen who cannot get to church read the daily, or at least the Sunday, Psalms and Lessons at home; and no religious custom, save that of daily prayer, is so widely spread among Englishmen as that of reading a chapter at night before going to bed. It may be doubted perhaps whether that is always the most profitable way of using a few minutes, whether a shorter piece thought out and digested would not be both less formal and more helpful; but the habit in any shape is invaluable as a safeguard and a stimulus, and its existence may fairly be attributed to the Table of Lessons in the Book of Common Prayer.

There is also another sense in which Anglican worship is Scriptural, and that is negatively. We use thankfully non-scriptural compositions, the *Te Deum*, the Creeds, the various prayers and collects; but in no case is anything admitted that is not based "on most certain warrants

of Holy Scripture.”* For instance, a great number of the collects for Saints’ days were rewritten at the Reformation, because they implied opinions about the present condition, employments and influence of the Saints departed, which (whether true or not) were at any rate not to be found in Scripture. All invocations of Saints of any kind whatever were on this ground cut out from the Litany and other services. Even so primitive and natural, nay, inevitable a custom as praying for the dead was rigorously broken through; and such prayers were reduced to a mere fraction of what had previously been practised, and thereby to a position closely corresponding to their place in Scripture.

And here again the Prayer-book has had its influence on the best of our English books of private devotion. Look at that noblest of them all, the *Devotions* of Bishop Andrewes. See how line after line, almost page after page, is built up out of texts of Scripture, culled, garnered, rearranged, put forth for use with fresh richness of significance. With what skill are the various incidents of Bible history, the reflexions and experiences of the inspired writers, turned round into prayers, and woven into the texture of the bishop’s aspirations, confessions, supplications. And with what fidelity does he restrain the rapid energy of his words and the wide range of his sympathies within the guiding lines of Bible teaching. All is sober, manly—if you will, severe. There is nothing fanciful, extravagant, morbid. His book of *Devotions*, said Dean Church, “was the reflection, in private prayer, of the tone and language of the public Book of Common Prayer, its Psalms and its offices: it supplemented the public book, and carried on its spirit from the Church to the closet.”

* The eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

"Nothing can be more comprehensive and more complete in their proportions than his devotions for each day; nothing more tender and solemn; nothing more compressed and nervous than their language. The full order of prayer and all its parts is always there: the introductory contemplation, to sober, to elevate, to kindle; the confession, the profession of faith, the intercession, the praise and thanksgiving. There is equally there the consciousness of individual singleness, and the sense of great and wide corporate relations. His confessions show in severely restrained and precise language the infinite acknowledgment of unworthiness and want, and the infinite hope in God's mercy and love, in one who searched and judged himself with keen and unflinching truth; but he did not stop at himself, his sins and hopes. He also felt himself, even in private prayer, one of the great body of God's creation and God's Church. He reminded himself of it, as he did of the Object of his worship, in the profession of his faith. He acted on it in his detailed and minute intercessions, and then he surrendered himself to the impulses of exulting wonder and rejoicing at the greatness of his Christian lot. The poetical and imaginative side of his nature shows itself in the vivid pictures which he calls up, with a few condensed and powerful touches, of the glories of Nature, and the wonders of God's kingdom, its history, its manifold organisation."*

It will perhaps be enough to set side by side with this description of truly Anglican prayers, what we believe to be a fair example of Roman devotional teaching.

"If you attach yourself from this day (of the first Communion) to Mary, if you regard her as your mother, if every day of your life you give her proof of your filial love, I say that you will not fall, and that if you fall, she will raise you again, and one day she will herself place you in the glory of heaven; none of you will be lost. . . . Here is another word still more astonishing. It is the great Saint Anselm who has said it. He for whom Mary shall pray one single time cannot be condemned to the eternal abyss. . . . If you pray every day, must there not be one day on which Mary will pray for you? And if she prays once, you are saved.

* *Masters in English Theology*, pp. 105, 102, 103.

You will not be lost, because God can refuse nothing to His Mother. Of all days the most solemn is the day of one's first Communion. If to-day you make a good prayer to Mary, it is impossible that she should not answer you, that she should not speak of you in heaven to God her Son," etc.*

It is easier to feel than to describe the gulf that divides the Roman and the Anglican conception of private prayer. The one is redolent of the Psalms; and, like George Herbert's† country parson, it is in the Holy Scriptures that Bishop Andrewes "sucks and lives." The other has laid aside the Bible to follow up precarious inferences‡ about the influence of the Blessed Virgin on her Son, and (no doubt without meaning it) tends to substitute trust in her sympathy for trust in His. The one is full of sober, thoughtful reverence at once for God and man: the other when reverent is too often abject and unreal, when expressing love is familiar and sentimental.

We cannot forget how much we are indebted to the best Roman writers and teachers, such as S. Vincent de Paul or S. Francis de Sales. But with the majority of Roman books, if they are to be transplanted to English soil, it is necessary not only to cut passages out which

* A Sermon by R. P. Lefèvre, Consécration à la Sainte Vierge, from Sermons by various authors; edited by M. l'Abbé C. Martin, 3rd edition, 1870, pp. 121-2.

† *A Priest to the Temple*, chap. iv., "The Parson's Knowledge."

‡ It may be well to add in a footnote an instance taken from another source and topic. The *Via del Paradiso* (p. 323, Turin, 1845) recommends a meditation on Purgatory, where the soul "desires to see God and cannot, awaits the moment of going to Paradise, but knows not when it will come: where they suffer torments much greater than all the torments of the world. . . . Consider for what faults one goes to Purgatory: a nun for whispering something at a choir office: a Religious for not bowing his head when saying the Gloria at the end of the Psalms. . . . Consider how long one stays in Purgatory. Let us allow for every venial sin a single day in Purgatory, and suppose that we commit thirty faults a day. Then one who lives sixty years on earth would spend 1,800 in Purgatory. Add to the venial sins some mortal sin, absolved indeed as to the guilt, but not paid off as to the penalty. How many more centuries in Purgatory?" etc.

are manifestly incompatible with Anglican teaching, but more than that, to change the whole tone and temper that they may be in harmony with the Prayer-book in its loyal faithfulness to Scripture.

III.

Besides being congregational and scriptural, the public worship of the Church of England has other striking features which need not detain us so long. We do not call them characteristics, for we make no claim to a unique possession of these qualities; and it is a sin against both truth and charity to prize nothing except that which is exclusively and peculiarly our own. We place then next in order the prominence given in our Prayer-book to the true motive and purpose of public worship, *the glory of God*. We meet together, as we are told in the exhortation at the beginning of Mattins and Evensong, first and foremost "to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at His hands, and to set forth His most worthy praise." And accordingly the chief place is given in these services to the Psalms, especially the *Venite*, and to the great Canticles. Again and yet again, after instructions in Lesson or sermon, after prayer and intercessions, we pause and lift up our hearts and voices in renewed praise and thanksgiving, in *Te Deum* or *Magnificat*, in anthem or in hymn. It is best, no doubt, when these acts of adoration can be rendered musically: but if they cannot be sung, they are still to be said, the anthem alone falling out when adequate singing is impossible. One way or the other God's praise must be set forth.

In the Eucharist, which is as the name* implies the

* It is perhaps the most ancient name of the service, after the "breaking of the bread."

chief act of the Church's thanksgiving, we must confess that too often this aspect of the service is somewhat neglected. The once frequent use of the first part alone without the second, and then, what was also common, the musical adornment only of the Kyrie and the Creed (though the Creed is really an act of thanksgiving as well as a profession of faith) followed by the silence of choir and organ in the essential part of the service, have tended to separate the ideas of communion and joy. Perhaps we have insisted, not too much but disproportionately, on self-examination before the service and absolution in it, on grace to be received to the disregard of homage to be rendered, on the Passion of our Lord rather than on the Resurrection and Ascension. Moreover many pious people prefer a plain and quiet service for Holy Communion, who yet delight in ornate music for such thanksgivings as the *Te Deum* and the *Magnificat*. And alas! in any case gratitude is always a difficult virtue to many of us. For such reasons our people have too often forgotten the glad festal side of that most solemn service, and come to it only in fear and trembling. But it can hardly be maintained that this setting of Holy Communion (as it were) in a minor key is according to the intention of the Prayer-book. For though opinions will differ as to the wisdom of the re-arrangement of the parts of the Liturgy made in 1552, and of the return in some points from later Western use to a more primitive type, yet it seems clear that at least the removal of the *Gloria in Excelsis* from the beginning to the end of the service was intended to make it a sort of climax of thanksgiving offered by sons, who had just renewed their fellowship with their Father in heaven. And when the Reformers emphasized the Communion feast, rather than the intercessory pleading of the sacrifice of Calvary, and treated the receiving of

the Body and Blood of Christ as the chief end of this Sacrament, the change should have had the effect, not as is sometimes said of obscuring the sacrificial and Godward aspects of Holy Communion, but only of restoring to their proper place the ideas of peace offering and thank offering, so as to stand side by side with the memorial of the one sin offering. The mediæval service was according to its written text a Eucharist, but it was too often regarded merely as a propitiatory sacrifice. When then the Reformers made prominent once more the ideas of spiritual feasting and food for the soul, the consequence ought to have been a more joyous and uplifting service.

"Above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man. . . . To him, therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give (as we are most bounden) continual thanks."*

So they wrote: such was their intention. And if the outcome has not fulfilled their wish, the failure has been largely due to Puritan influences that were not at bottom loyal to the English Church.

IV.

Anglicanism is *Catholic* in the proper sense of that much misused word. For, first, to go back to the original meaning of the phrase the Catholic Church, we recognise and we claim that the one Church is intended by God to be universal or Catholic, is designed for all times and all countries and all classes of men. To that one Church we claim to belong; not merely do we

* Exhortation in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion, beginning "Dearly beloved in the Lord."

as individuals hope that we are enrolled as citizens of the new Jerusalem that will be; but more than that, we believe that we are truly members of that world-wide society of the sons of God, which our Lord founded to continue His work on earth, until He comes again. Within this one Church the constraining force of political, geographical, racial distinctions, and the evil influences of error, misunderstanding, and exclusiveness have led to our being (if we may use the word) sub-organised as a national Church. But this is no more than occurred in the first days, when, for example, the Church of Carthage and the neighbouring parts of Africa was part of the one Catholic Church equally with the Church of Egypt, and yet each had its own unity of organisation, fellowship, and discipline. In the same way the Anglican Communion claims to be a part of the Church of Christ, a true and living part with a lawful independence within her own sphere. That independence we refuse to surrender at the demand of Rome, but we do not therefore refuse to recognise the authority of Rome within her sphere; we acknowledge her Confirmations and Ordinations as valid, and when her sons join us we do not pretend to confirm or ordain them again. And though our Articles of Religion justly accuse the Church of Rome of error in certain respects, we do not forget that in the Book of the Revelation even Sardis and Laodicea are still Churches, though one is ready to die and the other blind and naked; nor dare we forget it, for we too must again and again fall back on the same divine patience, that warns ere it blots out a Church.*

Catholic, then, in principle and in sympathy, the

* Cf. Bishop Andrewes' prayer: O Thou who walkest in the midst of the golden candlesticks, move not our candlestick out of its place, set in order the things that are wanting, stablish the things which Thou wast about to reject, which were ready to die.

Church of England cherishes all that may help to sustain fellowship with the rest of the universal Church. She takes her list of canonical books from the Church at large.* She delights to use ancient prayers and canticles. She keeps her days of fast and festival on the same principles, and so far as may be on the same days as the rest of Christendom. Her divine service, that is to say, her morning and evening prayer, is fundamentally the same that has come down to us from the fifth century. If she has abolished certain ceremonies that were practised in the Middle Ages, and disused some forms and kinds of prayer, it has been because she believed (rightly or wrongly) that they had been overlaid with superstition, or were in themselves not primitive and Catholic but corrupt; it has been from no wish to stand aloof or to affect a singularity as regards "laudable practices of the whole Catholick Church of Christ."†

And, in particular, Anglicanism appeals across the ages to what was taught and practised in the purest days of the Church, which were also the nearest to her Founder and to the beginnings of the Christian tradition. For nothing that is not primitive can be obligatory on the Church,‡ or be in the proper sense Catholic; to be Catholic it must be of all ages as well as of all places. Thus the Church of England fortifies her position on various points by an appeal to the custom of the primitive Church,§ or to the Fathers,|| while at the same time she claims the right "to ordain, change, and abolish

* See the sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

† See the Preface to the Prayer-book, third paragraph: and "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained."

‡ But, of course, individuals are bound by the lawful enactments of their own local church.

§ See the twenty-fourth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

|| See the sixth and twenty-ninth of the Articles, and the Preface Concerning the Service of the Church.

ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority."*

And in the same spirit she prays constantly for the reunion of Christendom through agreement in the truth of God's Word.† And "earnestly contending for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints,"‡ she trusts that she is, as she aims to be, Catholic in the secondary sense, in which it means faithful to the one Gospel proclaimed by Christians throughout the world, and testified to by witnesses from all ages and all parts of the Church, whether in their writings or in the more formal pronouncements of General Councils.

Catholic again in sympathy, the Church of England embraces all classes of men in her intercessions, and, in spite of artificial hindrances caused by her worldly position and history, is to-day the Church both of the richest and the poorest, the most holy and the most sin-stained, the most learned and the most ignorant, and she includes in her fellowship men of all colours and all degrees of civilisation.

It is no part of our purpose to discuss the defects in our Prayer-book, but at this point we cannot pass by the foremost of them. The catholicity of the spirit of the English Church would be more manifest if our services had given a larger scope and clearer prominence to prayer for Foreign Missions. For this we can hardly blame the Reformers of Edward's reign, when Englishmen had scarcely begun to explore the world: but in 1661 the need was felt and should have been more generously met. And now our chief feeling is that we must soon assert

* See the thirty-fourth Article and the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.

† See the prayers, For all sorts and conditions of men, and For the Church Militant. In both cases truth comes before unity, as being the way by which alone real, lasting unity can be secured.

‡ Jude 3.

our right to enlarge the Prayer-book, and once more adapt it to the changing needs of the times, that so first and foremost we may give its due place in intercession and thanksgiving to the evangelistic work of the Church. Through that work alone can the Church become completely Catholic. In that work lies the best hope for her reunion. And to "that pure and Apostolic branch of the Church to which we belong" God has plainly assigned the duty and the honour of being foremost in spreading the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, till the earth shall be filled therewith, as the waters cover the sea.*

And already outside the Prayer-book, where our energy is unfettered by Acts of Uniformity, much has been done to stimulate our sense of the catholicity of the Church. Scholars study the theology and liturgy of past ages and other countries in a spirit of friendliness, not of controversy. Our Bishops welcome opportunities of exchanging hospitality with the Bishops of other communions; and have sought to strengthen the weak knees of persecuted Churches in Assyria and elsewhere. Interest in colonial and evangelistic work advances every day. But most of all, and especially of late, do we find in private books of devotion, and in manifold organisations for united supplication, and in the public Day of Intercession for Foreign Missions, a quickened zeal for the spread of the Gospel, and a real desire for true catholicity expressing itself in prayers to Almighty God. But after all, this yearning towards a wider, deeper fellowship is no new thing. It was strong in Andrewes as he prayed for the Catholic Church, the Eastern Church, the Western, our own. It was strong in Dr. Bray and the founders of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. It made itself heard with victorious force in the cry, now vulgarised, but

* Habakkuk ii. 14.

once dreaded by slave-owners as unwelcome truth is always dreaded, "The negro is a man and a brother." And it shows itself to-day in the ever-increasing but little-known activity of our Missions, which from time to time attracts the notice of the world, when there gather for conference at Lambeth Bishops from the whole Anglican Communion, from Churches established as in India, or disestablished as in Scotland and Ireland, from colonial Churches like those of Australia, or missionary Churches such as those in the heart of Africa, or Churches of separate nationality and organisation like those of the United States and of Japan.

V.

Sobriety. We have said something already about the moral tone and temper of the worship of the English Church: and need add but little more. Familiar though they are, we trust to be pardoned for quoting once more the words of Keble:—

"Next to a sound rule of faith, there is nothing of so much consequence as a sober standard of feeling in matters of practical religion: and it is the peculiar happiness of the Church of England to possess, in her authorised formularies, an ample and secure provision for both. But in times of much leisure and unbounded curiosity, when excitement of every kind is sought after with a morbid eagerness, this part of the merit of our Liturgy is likely in some measure to be lost, on many even of its sincere admirers: the very tempers which most require such discipline setting themselves, in general, most decidedly against it."

How thoroughly is this "soothing tendency" of our Prayer-book exemplified by Keble himself in the *Christian Year*! How truly applicable are the words "a sober standard of feeling" to writers so widely divided in time and circumstances as George Herbert and Archbishop

Trench, William Law, Bishop Wilson, and Christina Rossetti!

If we try to analyse the elements that combine to produce the effect, we shall perhaps be right in choosing two for special notice. First, the constant insistence of the Prayer-book on penitence and self-examination. Thus all our ordinary services have their confessions and their absolutions, a feature which is sometimes made a ground for complaint. For religious people, on the one hand, have been known to demur to the language of the confessions as implying too profound a depth of contrition for their shallowness, and often by their very protest they show themselves to have been led by the Prayer-book at least to wish for a truer sorrow for sin. On the other hand, objection is also made to the frequency of the absolutions, and the attempt is made by extremists on either side to reduce them to vague assurances or reminders of pardon otherwise bestowed. Such criticisms will, at any rate, serve to indicate the influence of these repeated acknowledgments of sin, of these messages of pardon from God. They tend to keep the mind of the loyal son of the Church of England subdued, humble, contrite, calm, never content with his attainments, always yearning for something higher, never fretful, never despondent, always confident in the Father's love.

And, secondly, there is the silent influence of the chaste dignity of Anglican ritual and services. This is dangerous ground to tread, for from both sides may come the denial that there is sufficient conformity to type to give meaning to such a sentence. How can you call the one extreme dignified or the other chaste? With our reckless tolerance alike of excess and defect, is it possible to speak of a distinctively Anglican ritual at all? In spite of the criticism we thus anticipate, we believe our assertion to be true. For there is first the great central body who officiate

in all our cathedrals, and probably in three parish churches out of every four, and whose services vary as regards ritual in points of no significance, or in details which are scarcely discernible by the devout. And, secondly, the extremes themselves are influenced by the central tradition ; so that the coldest and barest services are more reverent and dignified than they would be in the chapel hard by, while the most elaborate and ornate are more restrained and sober than would be found among the same class of people with the Romans. It may be that the services that are nearest to the central type are too severe, too stereotyped, too cold ; it is probably in this direction that our weakness lies. But warmth and variety would be dearly purchased if they meant sensational efforts Sunday by Sunday to work up people's feelings and rouse excitement, to stimulate instantaneous conversions, or embitter political or religious controversy ; or if on the other hand they fostered sentimental devotions and unreal extravagances of inward or outward worship, such practices as soon lose their meaning and their value as they become familiar and are repeated half unconsciously. It is precisely the sobriety, the reserve—if you will, the dull respectable uniformity—of Anglican services, that creates the devout, humble, restful tone of character that we most need, the meek and quiet spirit which the Apostle praises.

VI.

Finally we turn from worship to discipline, from public services and private prayers and their influence on character, to consider the rules of life and practice prescribed to Churchmen in our Prayer-book. The Church's aim herein has been to train her children to self-government ; they are called to be sons of God, not bond-servants, children of the freewoman, not of the hand-

maid, friends of Christ who know what their Lord doeth. But in this matter she has been influenced not only by our Lord and by St. Paul, but also by the genius of our political life; and that perhaps not wholly for good. In secular matters there has been of late a great enlargement of State control; but in religion Church discipline is still too much relaxed. As citizens we live for the most part as unconscious of the restraints of the law as we are of the pressure of the atmosphere, so that we resent any intrusion of State authority into our domestic life, compelling us to educate or to vaccinate our children, fining us for letting our house catch fire, or an unmuzzled dog get loose. And it is much the same in the things of the Church. Up to a point we are obedient enough to her authority, much more obedient than is commonly realised. Sunday, the Bible, Infant Baptism, the observance of Christmas and Easter, are all instances of an acceptance of Church decisions and enactments, which is for the most part glad and unquestioning. But we resent any novel and unexpected assertion of the Church's claim, even though it be plainly written down in the Prayer-book, and has only been ignored through slack disuse: and there are few things that rouse us to keener opposition than any emphasizing of ecclesiastical authority.

As a matter of fact there are not many positive rules that are laid upon us by the Church, as distinct from our moral duties towards God and towards our neighbour. There are the Sacraments, and the rule that orders Communion at the least three times in the year. There is a Calendar with a list of Fasts and Festivals. There is the obligation laid on parents to have their children baptized betimes, to send them to be catechized, and in due time to be confirmed. But there is nothing more of this sort. And in particular it is noteworthy that the Prayer-book contains no such translation of the Fourth Commandment

into Christian language as would impose this or that definite duty or prohibition upon Churchmen.*

It is difficult to be sure how much is exacted of the layman of the Roman obedience in the way of doctrinal testing of his faith. But it is certainly more than in the English Church, where nothing is demanded beyond assent to the "Apostles' Creed. In this faith the Anglican is baptized, and about this faith he is questioned on his sick-bed.† With the Thirty-nine Articles the laity have no direct concern. Though they may be ignorant of them, or misunderstand them, or even (except so far as concerns doctrines included in the Creed) disbelieve them, yet they do not thereby forfeit their right to communicate with the rest of the Church. Here as usual Anglicanism occupies a middle position; for while Romanism explicitly or implicitly demands much more, Nonconformity (as a rule) requires much less. And we claim that the mean is no mere halting compromise, but that in excellence it is the very best. "The truth," said our Lord, "shall make you free." Anglican freedom, then rests in the first place on the assertion of the vital truths of the Gospel as declared in the "Apostles' Creed. But there is another enemy to freedom besides error, and that is the presumption of unwarranted assertion refusing to allow discussion; and

* According to the Catechism, the Fourth Commandment means that we are to serve God truly all the days of our life. Some of the rubrics seem to assume that Sunday will be marked by a larger attendance at public worship: for instance, provision is made (indirectly) for a sermon every Sunday; but there are no special Sunday services, nor even special parts of services, except the Lessons proper for Sundays. The Romans on the other hand append six commandments of the Church to the Ten Commandments of God, and the first of them is this: "On Sundays and on Festivals thou shalt hear Mass." Two of the others are "All thy sins thou shalt confess at least once a year"; and "Thou shalt communicate at least at Easter."

† The use of the "Nicene" Creed in the Communion Service is not to be regarded as the addition of another test, for in the Communion of the Sick the Creed is altogether omitted, the sick man having already (it is presumed) declared his steadfast acceptance of the older and shorter formula.

we dare not hamper freedom by requiring as tests of communion definite statements where Scripture gives us no clear guidance.*

In fact the Church of England has no fear of the human intellect. She has ever sought to explain to men her services and her ritual, her principles and her aims; and to explain is to appeal to reason. She orders a sermon or at least a homily, every week. She disuses all legends and "uncertain stories" such as strain the allegiance of reasonable men. In all things the Church of England faces the world with a rational doctrine, a rational liturgy, a rational system. And ever since the days when Casaubon, the most learned man of his time, came from France to England and thanked God for being admitted to her Communion, seeing in her "the features of the ancient Church as he had learnt them in the writings of the Fathers," † she has been, as the Bishop of London has lately said, the Church of learned men.‡

The same delight in freedom and confidence in men's own consciences and judgments, as guided by the Holy Spirit of God, is seen in the Anglican treatment of the burning question of auricular confession. There is to be no compulsion; there is to be no prohibition. Each man is to decide for himself when and how often, if at all, he will use the ministry of private confession and absolution. And therein he is encouraged to expect

* True, the clergy are further called upon to give a somewhat vague assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, but this is because they speak more precisely on certain disputed points, with regard to which it is necessary to be assured that those who teach in the Church's name will really teach the truth. But the Articles throughout keep close to Scripture, and apply its teaching without adding to it.

† Ep. 703.

‡ Is it necessary to add that this trust in reason is really trust in God, Who gave us reason, Whose Son is reason (*Λόγος*), Whose Spirit guides and illuminates our reason, Who asks of us reasonable service or worship (Rom. xii. 1)?

"ghostly counsel and advice," but he is not told to give abject obedience to this direction. How different from such teaching as this! "The priest is Jesus Christ, who speaks to you and hears you. With what respect would you receive the counsel of an angel! The priest by his office is above the angels. He is with regard to you the extension of Jesus Christ."*

Self-government in reliance on God, with dutiful use of that which the Church dispenses, the Word of God and His holy Sacraments—that is the Anglican ideal. The Roman leaves out the self-government; the ultra-Protestant, to use Dean Hook's phrase, leaves out the grace of the Sacraments. And have not we our characteristic failure? Do we not too often forget that self-government ought to mean a stricter carefulness and wariness, lest in ignorance we wander from the way, lest in wilfulness we let liberty become licence, lest while we rejoice in the fewness of the restraints laid upon us we forget to be loyally obedient to those commands there are?

Such, then, seem to be the leading principles of the English Prayer-book, viewed in the three aspects in which it most concerns us, first and principally as a manual for public worship, secondly as a guide for our private devotions, and thirdly as containing those rules of a "Christian and virtuous life," which the Church of England lays upon her sons. Her ideal of worship is congregational and Scriptural, Catholic and primitive; she teaches us to place the glory of God before us as the supreme end, both of our devotional exercises and of active life; she bids us embrace within the scope of our intercessions the whole world and all classes of men; she prays earnestly for the reunion of Christendom; she would fain cultivate in us a type of religion that is at

* *Avís Spirituels*, p. 159 (10th edition, Paris, 1873).

once humble and confident, penitential and eucharistic, chastened and fervent. And when she speaks with the authority of a mother laying command upon her children, she looks upon them not as infants whom she dare not leave alone lest they fall into mischief, but as sons who are growing up towards spiritual manhood in Christ, and are therefore to be guided into reasonable self-governing freedom, in reliance on the aid of God the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth. And so, to quote the closing words of the latest written preface to the Prayer-book, "We have good hope that what is (in that Book) presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

VIII.

Relations with the Eastern Churches

By A. C. HEADLAM, B.D.

I N the formation of our religious opinions one of the main elements must always be the predominant religious systems with which we are acquainted. For many it may very likely, for some it must be the case that they never really have the actual experience necessary for even a moderately correct opinion. We are naturally attracted or repelled by what we are acquainted with, or by what is obvious. Now what may be true of individuals in many various ways is, to a certain extent, true on a larger scale of all Western Christians. There are certain facts which are clear, definite, and obvious. There is the existence of the Church of Rome, with the claims that it makes. There is the existence of all the varied Protestant bodies, both Continental and English-speaking. There is, for us, the existence of the Anglican Church, which, to some, in its position of a *via media*, may seem to combine the merits of both sides, to many appears as a somewhat amorphous, incoherent body which, because it carries no view to an extreme, seems halting and illogical. Yet these are not the whole facts of Christianity. There is another Church, or rather

group of Churches, not very obvious to us in England, almost unknown to the majority, which yet from any careful inquirer into the character of Christianity must demand considerable attention, namely, the Eastern Churches. They are important both for their numbers and for their historical position. Eastern Christianity numbers probably 100,000,000 adherents, and embraces one of the most rapidly increasing races in the world, the Russian; while the Eastern Churches claim, and it is a claim which must at any rate be examined, to preserve unchanged the traditions of the apostolic Church, without any of the violent alterations which have undoubtedly characterised Western Christianity. In examining, therefore, into the credentials and character of Anglicanism, it is reasonable to ask what are the bearings of Eastern Christianity upon its claims, and what are and have been its relations to the Churches of the East.

Eastern Christianity consists of two main divisions—the Orthodox Eastern Church, and the heretical or separated communities. The latter include the Armenians, who have never accepted, and possibly reject, the decisions of the Fourth General Council; the Copts of Egypt, the Jacobites of Northern Syria, and the Abyssinians, all of whom are definitely Monophysite in their creed; and the Nestorians of the mountains north of Mesopotamia, who are the remains of a Church, once large and important, which never accepted the decrees of the Third General Council. None of these bodies are very numerous; they are not remarkable for any great spiritual or theological power; and they are interesting chiefly as historical survivals, perhaps bearing witness in their isolated existence to a period before they separated, namely, to the early part of the fifth century, but by the very fact of their heresy clearly imperfect in their

traditions. We may use their historical evidence, if with some caution; we may sympathise with the tenacity with which they have preserved their creed, in spite of the centuries of persecution to which they have been exposed; we may do all in our power to help them; but to seek direct reunion with them until they are reconciled to the Eastern Church from which they have separated, or, at any rate, until they have cleared themselves from the charge of heresy, would be to violate just those fundamental beliefs which are accepted explicitly or implicitly by all orthodox Christians, Protestant and Catholic alike. We may be impatient at what seem to us now, and perhaps have become in reality, only verbal differences; but such impatience would only be productive ultimately of greater difficulties. It would help to stereotype rather than check division.

The orthodox Eastern Church is very different. Its size, at any rate, is imposing. It consists of the Four Eastern Patriarchates—Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem—of the autocephalous Church of Cyprus; of the national Churches of free Greece, Servia, Bulgaria,* Montenegro, Roumania, and Russia; and of 9,000,000 of orthodox Christians in the Austrian Empire. In creed, in rites, in discipline and traditions all these Churches are almost absolutely identical. Their unity is complete; but owing to differences of history, of tone, and temper a broad distinction may be made between the Greek and Russian portions. Most of the Greeks are still subject to Turkish rule; all of them have been; and they have suffered much through misrule, misgovernment, and want of liberty. Their Church is Greek in language and character, exhibiting very strongly the characteristics of the nation. The Russian Church is also national, with all the strength and weakness that that

* The so-called Bulgarian schism may for our purpose be ignored.

implies, and is deeply influenced by the temperament of the Slavonic race. Whatever may be its faults (and they are certainly not as great as its detractors would have us believe), it has the very strongest hold on the people, and there is no nation in the world so intensely religious as the Russian. Whatever may be the case with a certain number of the upper classes, the vast mass of the people is ardently and, in a way, intelligently attached to their Church. It is the real source of their strength. It has a considerable body of learned theologians; it has produced men of genuinely spiritual life and teaching. Russia and the Russian Church must be one of the most important elements in the religious future of the world.

The theological position of the Eastern Church is, at any rate to itself, clear and definite. Its teaching claims to be that of the undivided Church before the schism which separated East and West, and to preserve pure and unadulterated the traditions and customs of the apostolic age. It formulates this claim in the acceptance of the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed, the Seven General Councils, and the Seven Sacraments. Its liturgies and other service-books probably give the truest exposition of its real belief, for the *lex orandi* is the *lex credendi*. In addition to these services there are a number of different documents of greater or less degree of authority which have been put forth from time to time. To the seventeenth century belong the *Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Church*,* the work of Peter Mogila, and the *Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem and Bethlehem*,† held in 1672.

* English translation edited by Overbeck and Robertson. London, 1898.

† English translation by J. W. W. B. Robertson. London, 1899. This is from the Greek. The decrees were modified before being published in Russia. See NEALE'S *Eastern Church*, ii., p. 1173, and PALMER, *Notes on a Visit to the Russian Church*, p. 67.

Both these belong to the period when the Church was most under Roman influence, and in some points at any rate are not popular at the present day. More representative, at any rate of the Russian Church, is the *Longer Catechism*,* the work of Archbishop Philaret. For the Greek part of the Church there are several catechisms published, the most important that of Kyriakos; but these are not authoritative works. All the Greek documents have a tendency to be more rigid in character. In this essay it is proposed, first of all, to give a short history of the relations between the Greek and English Churches from the time of the Reformation;† then to discuss somewhat fully the points of difference between the two Churches. This will lead on to certain general considerations; the importance to the Anglican Church of the existence of the Eastern Church; the lessons and warning that it may give us; the possibility and desirability of reunion. Finally, the general policy which our Church ought to pursue in its relations with the East will be considered.

In the sixteenth century the connection between the two Churches was very slight. The position of the English Church was built up on a basis of historical knowledge, without any substantial assistance from the attitude or remains of Eastern Christendom. Yet there are some slight traces of its influence in the Prayer-book. The prayer of St. Chrysostom comes directly from the Greek liturgy of that name. Some suffrages in the Litany come directly from the Deacons' Litany. The Invocation

* English translation by Blackmore, *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*. Aberdeen, 1845. A new one is in preparation.

† On this see especially GEORGE WILLIAMS, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century and the Nonjurors*, London, 1868; and *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates*, a Lecture by the Bishop of Salisbury.

in the consecration prayer of the first Prayer-book may perhaps have Oriental affinities. There is some reason for thinking that Cranmer possessed and made use of the edition of the Greek liturgy published at Venice in 1528.* But all these points are very slight. The English Articles seem to go out of their way to condemn some of the Eastern Churches; English divines made no use in controversy of Eastern liturgies; it was their Roman opponents who relied on them. We cannot, in fact, say that a knowledge of the position, the traditions or opinions of the Eastern Church substantially affected the English, and it is somewhat remarkable that, whether by historical research or political expediency, it should have obtained a position so much resembling that of the Easterns.

But the Eastern Church, if it had little influence on the formation of the English Church, helped undoubtedly in the creation of our Anglican theology. That the English Church, which was so largely affected by Calvinism in Queen Elizabeth's reign, became Anglican and not Calvinist, is due not only to her formularies and Prayer-book, but also to the learning of her leading clergy. She inherited the sober traditions of Erasmus, Colet, and More, she was strengthened by the support of foreign scholars like Casaubon, and an acquaintance with the history and tenets of the Eastern Church provided her theologians with a strong and clear argument for their main position.

A number of causes combined to bring the Eastern Church before the minds of English scholars in the seventeenth century. During Queen Elizabeth's reign the foundation of the Levant Company was the beginning of our Mediterranean trade. From that time onward we had our ambassador at Constantinople, we had factories at Smyrna and Aleppo, with chaplains who did much

* See DOWDEN, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*.

good work in studying the religion and language of the people around them. English travellers in the East became more numerous. The Roman Church made great efforts at this time to win the East in order to provide something to counterbalance Protestantism, and Constantinople became a scene of ecclesiastical intrigue, into which the English ambassador was drawn. Another cause of contact between the two Churches was the personality of Cyril Lucar, from 1602 to 1617 Patriarch of Alexandria; from 1617 to 1638 of Constantinople. A Cretan, more learned than any other members of his Church, he had been educated in the West, and had travelled in Europe, having possibly visited England. He became strongly anti-Roman in his opinions, was anxious to correct some of the faults of his own Church, and laid himself open to the charge of Calvinism. Continuously combating the Jesuit intrigues, he was eventually put to death by the Porte, apparently as a result of their machinations. His confession was published by his enemies after his death, and was condemned by the Eastern Church as clearly Calvinist in a series of synods ending with that of Bethlehem in 1672, which show the high-water mark of Roman influence in the East.

The result of these various causes was that the Eastern Church became a very definite fact for English theologians. In 1617 Cyril Lucar sent a certain Metrophanes Critopoulos to study at Oxford, where he was supported at the expense of Archbishop Abbot, and we have our first letter from an Anglican Archbishop to an Eastern Patriarch, a letter sufficiently remarkable to demand quotation. Abbot writes:—

“There are many things which testify the sympathy existing between and the sweet agreement enjoyed by members of the Universal Church; but at this time I feel it on this account

especially, in that I am enabled to embrace with both arms your brotherhood, whom I have never seen face to face, though divided from me by many a league of land and sea, as if present; for the unity of faith binds each to each, and the common bond of love joins us by one and the self-same Spirit, by whom we live with Christ whom we both breathe."*

The many small points of connection between the Churches—not all by any means satisfactory—are not worth dwelling on in detail. The Greek student Critopoulos seems to have caused some uneasiness; but he returned home and ultimately became Patriarch of Alexandria. At a somewhat later date we find a certain Nathanael Conopius, Proto-Syncellus of Cyril Lucar, resident in Oxford, who became a Petty Canon of Christ Church,† and we find the ambassador complaining of the number of Greeks who desire passports for England. Among Oriental travellers, consuls, and chaplains may be mentioned Sandys, Pocock the Orientalist, Rycaut,‡ Smith,§ and Covel,|| all of whom wrote works on the Greek Church, and a certain Dr. Basire,¶ afterwards Archdeacon of Northumberland, who during the period of the Civil Wars wandered about the Levant with a translation of the Church Catechism into modern Greek, by which he hoped to win the Eastern Patriarchs to the Anglican communion.

The existence of the Greek Church now becomes a main point in the Roman controversy. The orthodoxy of the Greeks is discussed in the conference between Laud and

* NEALE, *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, ii. p. 387.

† WOOD, *Athen. Oxon.*, p. 657.

‡ *The Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, 1678.

§ THO. SMITH, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, *An Account of the Greek Church, as to its Doctrine and Rites*, 1676, 1680.

|| *Account of the Greek Church*, 1740.

¶ *Correspondence of Isaac Basire, D.D.*, by W. N. DARNELL. London, 1831.

Fisher. When the Church of England definitely claims to be Catholic, the appeal to a Church whose traditional position it was difficult to deny, as equally rejecting the claims of the Roman See, becomes of primary importance. As Stillingfleet put it very moderately :—

“For it is sufficiently known how much the Greeks agree with us in the opposition to the great point of the Pope’s supremacy, and the infallibility of the Church of Rome; how far they are from the belief of Purgatory in your sense, and several other things which are contained in the decrees of the Council of Trent.”*

Eastern liturgies also had a definite influence. We know that Bishop Andrewes had in his library the service-books of the Eastern Churches; that he prayed in his devotions for the unity of Christendom in language drawn from the Eastern Liturgy, while the Scotch service-book, of 1637, drawn up under the influence of Laud, shows Eastern influences very definitely in the Invocation in the prayer of consecration, which has passed thence to the American Prayer-book.

We may just refer to one curious incident at the close of the seventeenth century. An attempt was made at Gloucester Hall, afterwards Worcester College, to found an institution for the education of Greeks in Oxford. It failed, owing, we are told, to the machinations of the Jesuits, to the difficulty of preserving discipline, and to the bad conduct of some of its members. Ultimately the Patriarch forbade any Greek to study in Oxford.†

The eighteenth century, as may be imagined, was not one in which the relations between the two Churches would be very close, but for the first time definite approaches for the sake of reunion were made, not by the Church

* STILLINGFLEET, *Works*, vol. iv. p. 481.

† See *Union Review*, vol. i. pp. 490-500. London, 1863.

itself, but by the small Nonjuring schism—a body which preserved probably all the prejudices of the English Church. In attempting to open up communications they described themselves as “the Catholic remnant of the British Churches”; they sent a proposal of reunion with a statement of doctrine on the points on which the two Churches differed. The answer of the Eastern Patriarchs, who were much less sympathetic than the Holy Synod of Russia, is a very interesting document, both for its historical statements and for the exhibition it affords of some prominent characteristics of the Eastern Church.

“Our Oriental Church, the immaculate bride of the Lord, has never at any time admitted any novelty, nor will at all allow of any, but observes that saying, ‘Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have placed.’

“The Oriental Orthodox Church acknowledges but one Liturgy, the same which was delivered down by the Apostles, but written by the First Bishop of Jerusalem, James the brother of God, and afterwards abbreviated on account of its length by the great Father Basil, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and after that again epitomized by John, the golden-tongued Patriarch of Constantinople.”

The letters of the Nonjurors were not perhaps in any way distinguished for wisdom, but the replies of the Orientals meet them by the most rigid assertion of doctrine, and show no intention of yielding a single point. The whole incident was however closed by the matter coming to the ears of Archbishop Wake, who wrote to explain that the persons writing did not represent the English Church, at the same time expressing very definitely his sympathy with the Eastern Church.

“Meanwhile, we, the true Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, as, in every fundamental article, we profess the same faith with you, shall not cease, at least in spirit and effect (since

otherwise owing to our distance from you we cannot), to hold communion with you, and to pray for your peace and happiness. And I, as I do profess myself most specially bounden to your Holiness, so do I most earnestly entreat you to remember me in your prayers and sacrifices at the Holy Altar of God. And so I bid you farewell in the Lord.”*

In the year 1772 a work on the Russian Church was published by a certain John King, who had been chaplain at St. Petersburg. It is by far the best work on the Russian Church in England, containing translations of almost all the offices. Most important is the testimony that the author bears to the character of the Russian Church in his day.

“I can say with truth,” he writes, “of those with whom I have the honour of personal acquaintance, and I believe in general of the rest, that the superior clergy of Russia at this time are men whose candour, modesty, and truly primitive simplicity of manners would have illustrated the first ages of Christianity.” And again: “The many falsehoods and ridiculous stories reported of this Church, and spread over all countries, persuaded me that this is a subject hitherto little known.”†

In the early part of the nineteenth century the influence of the Church of England in the East was exercised mainly through the Church Missionary Society. The principles and training of their missionaries would preclude them from having much sympathy with the Churches among which they were working. They would not be likely to make all the necessary allowance for any faults that they might find. But their intention was to work on right lines. They did not intend to make separate communities. “It was thought that the Oriental Churches

* G. WILLIAMS, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, p. lviii. London, 1868.

† *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, by JOHN GLEN KING, pp. xii., xiv. London, 1772.

might be moved to self-reformation, and that, through them, the gospel might be spread among the Mohammedans." The enterprise as a whole failed. Circumstances were not favourable; probably many of the agents had not the necessary sympathy. But individual cases are recorded of good work.

"In the island of Syra the Rev. F. A. Hildner conducted an important school from 1829 to 1876, when old age obliged him to give up his work; but he remained in the island, and on his death in 1883 received great honours, the Greek Cathedral being lent to the Anglican chaplain at Athens for the funeral service, and the Greek Archbishop delivering a touching address to a vast concourse of people."

An interesting mission was started in Egypt. A Mr. Lieder from Basle, an agent of the Society, was its head. Schools were founded at Cairo, and particularly an important Coptic seminary, in which Egyptian boys of the Coptic Church received a scriptural education with a view to their ordination as ministers of that Church. Mr. Lieder remained at his post until his death, although the school had been already given up. He was universally respected. At a later date the Coptic Patriarch referred with commendation to his work, and he received the high encomium of being condemned by Bishop Gobat. "When, however, Bishop Gobat visited the Mission in 1849 he was of opinion that it was conducted too cautiously, and that Protestant doctrine should be more boldly maintained; and he urged that younger missionaries should be sent out for that purpose." Luckily this was never done; but it is much to be regretted that work well begun should not have been continued by others as devoted as Mr. Lieder, and with full sympathy for the ancient Egyptian Church.

We must give one more extract, as this part of our

narrative is important; it is taken from a letter of Mr. Venn to Bishop Blomfield in 1851:—

“It has never been the object of the Society to form amongst these Oriental Christians congregations according to the model of the Church of England, as in heathen countries; our object has been, by journeys, by the Press, and by education, to disseminate the knowledge of scriptural truth throughout the country, in order, by God’s grace, to raise the tone of Christian doctrine and practice. For this purpose our missionaries have visited persons of all ranks, including many of the highest ecclesiastics; they have distributed the Holy Scriptures and religious books in all languages. We leave to other agencies, under the providence of God, the work of settled pastoral ministrations and parochial education. We rejoice especially whenever a priest of their own communion can be found among them to supply his people with scriptural instruction and pastoral care.”

The above narrative and extracts will show sufficiently well that the Church Missionary Society began their work in the East on principles loyal to the traditions of the Church of England, and not without sympathy and hope for the ancient Eastern Churches.

In 1841 the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem was founded. It was a well-intentioned scheme; it was also a very unwise one. It was intended surreptitiously to introduce episcopacy into the Lutheran by a connection with the English Church, and to bring both Churches into nearer contact with the East. Of the disastrous results it had in England we need not speak; in the East it might have worked very much better, for no Oriental bishop could have considered the presence of an English bishop in Jerusalem in any way undesirable, nor would the presence of the English Church there have worked anything but good, if there had been no members of other Churches drawn away. The purpose in founding the

bishopric is stated quite clearly in a letter from Archbishop Howley to the Eastern Patriarch:—

“But that no one may be ignorant why we have sent this Bishop our brother, we make known to you, that we have charged him in no wise and in no matter to invade the jurisdiction of you the Bishops or others bearing rule in the Churches of the East, but rather to show you due honour and reverence, and to be ready, on all occasions and by all means, to cultivate diligently whatever promotes brotherly love, intercourse and unanimity. We are persuaded that this our brother is willing, and will feel himself in conscience bound, to follow these our injunctions: and we beseech you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to receive him as a brother, and to afford him all needful help.

“We are persuaded, brethren, that Your Holinesses will receive this communication as a testimony of our reverence and brotherly love towards you, and of our longing desire to renew that ancient love towards the ancient Churches of the East which has been suspended for ages, which, if restored, by the will and blessing of God, may have the effect of healing the schisms which have brought the most grievous calamities on the Church of Christ.”*

Under the first Bishop, Alexander, the policy pursued seems to have been quite legitimate, and his chaplain, George Williams, was more than anyone else instrumental in creating in this country an interest in Eastern Christianity. But with the appointment by Prussia in 1846 of Bishop Gobat there was a change. It may be true that, as his defenders state, he did not deliberately proselytise, that he only received those whose conscience would not allow them to remain in their own Church, and it was quite clear that that had been sanctioned by the Archbishop in England; but the real question is whether his teaching had been such as to encourage members of the Eastern Church to be loyal to their own community, and to show their loyalty by attempting to revive its spiritual

* WILLIAMS, *The Eastern Church and the Nonjurors*, p. lxii.

life, or whether he had practically made them feel that salvation was not really possible in a body, the corruptness of which had been persistently impressed upon them. A perusal of the Bishop's own writings can, I think, leave no doubt that the latter was his policy. He need not be blamed. He was a sincere and devoted man, acting quite consistently with his convictions. The incident is rather instructive as showing the unwisdom of artificial alliances between two Churches which do not really agree in teaching, and in explaining the origin of a situation which, as has been shown, is quite inconsistent with the very steady and continuous policy of the English Church in the East, expressed not only in archiepiscopal utterances, but also in the records of the C.M.S. The congregations of English Christians in the East were for the most part formed, not by the Society, but by Bishop Gobat; it was not the Society but the Bishop who inaugurated the change in policy. These congregations were, after the Bishop's death, taken over by the Society, and they have necessarily kept them going. Some of their missionaries are more zealous than others, some have better Anglican traditions than others. The policy of the Society is not what the present writer would consider quite correct or ultimately wise, but it is one into which they have drifted, and one from which they are escaping. Their mission in Palestine has been, since 1875, intended to be mainly for Mohammedans, and the work is definitely more and more taking that direction.*

These incidents have been dwelt on at some length in order to bring out that, in spite of a natural want of sympathy, and although their action has not been always

* The above statements and extracts are taken from a pamphlet, *The C.M.S. in Palestine*, published by the Society in 1891, and containing extracts from the *C.M. Intelligencer* of April, 1887, *The C.M.S. Missions in the East*.

the same, the fundamental idea of the C.M.S. has been not inconsistent with that which alone can conduce to Christian unity and the spiritual well-being of the East. If we will produce good fruit we must, in a spirit of abnegation, be ready to help the Churches of the East on their own lines. But to imitate the policy of the Roman Church, and to create one more series of separated communities, is simply to weaken Christianity and destroy all reality of religious convictions.

During the past sixty years there has been a considerable amount of interest taken by the English Church in the Eastern, and some by the Eastern in the English. The history of the Eastern Church has been written by Neale and Williams. An Eastern Church Association founded by the latter attracted a considerable number of writers. William Palmer, in his simple-minded search after an ideal Church, which he was fated never to find, drew our attention to Russia. The American Church joined in the movement, and appointed a committee of foreign relations. Visits of Englishmen to the East, and visits of Eastern ecclesiastics to England, have helped to increase knowledge, and the letters of the Lambeth Conference have clearly and definitely asserted the claims and desire for friendship of the English Church.*

Fresh interest was aroused in the Eastern Church by the Vatican Council of 1870, the promulgation of the Infallibility of the Pope, and the Old Catholic movement on the Continent. This led to the Bonn Conferences of 1874 and 1875 under the presidency of Dr. Döllinger, in which representatives of the English, Old Catholics, and Easterns took part. The conferences made very prominent the ability and the learning of their President, and any result that they had was entirely due to him. In

* See for example the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury after the first Lambeth Conference in 1867. WILLIAMS, *op. cit.*, p. lxxv.

the conference of the first year the whole position was reviewed. The divines who represented the Eastern Church were men of cultivation and learning. They were sincerely anxious to be accommodating, but we may detect in them a characteristic which we may find in that Church even more than elsewhere—it is indeed a failing common to all theologians—the assumption that the basis even of discussion must be the acceptance of their own attitude. At this conference one of the Eastern representatives stated :—

“A reunion of the two Churches appears to me to be either very easy or very difficult of accomplishment, according to that which we make the starting-point of our negotiations. It is easy if we make it ‘the basis of the undivided Church,’ as expressed in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, the Seven General Councils, and the doctrine of the Seven Sacraments.”

Dr. Döllinger immediately pointed out that the seven sacraments were not mentioned in the decrees of the Seven General Councils. The reply was that although that was so, and the number seven was not formally used, that substantially this summed up the teaching of the undivided Church, and it was stated that “the three points I have mentioned must be insisted upon unconditionally.”* Dr. Döllinger by his remark brought out the whole weakness of this position. If it is admitted that the insistence on Seven Sacraments is not a doctrine of the undivided Church, and it is quite clear that it was not, then, however valid the rest of the argument may be, the question must be open to discussion. But the Eastern theologian is only too much addicted to supplement his appeal to an undivided Church by the assumption that his interpretation of that Church is absolutely correct. It is a fault that he shares with many

* *Report of the Bonn Conference of 1874*, p. 33. London, 1875.

other theologians; perhaps certain circumstances make him do it more uncompromisingly than some others, but until the habit ceases on all sides conferences for reunion will be quite unavailing.

The second conference in 1874 discussed the *Filioque*, and succeeded in arriving at certain definite conclusions. The addition to the creed was pronounced irregular, and the doctrine of the *Procession* formulated in the following series of propositions drawn from the works of John of Damascus, and accepted by both sides as a sufficient statement. The references to the writings of the Father are omitted in the following :—*

1. We agree in accepting the Œcumenical Creeds and the dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

2. We agree in admitting that the addition of the *Filioque* to the symbolum was not made in a canonical manner.

3. We adhere on all sides to the form of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as it is taught by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

4. We reject every notice and every mode of expression in which in any way the acceptance of two Principles, or ἀρχαὶ, or αἰτίαι, in the Trinity, would be involved.

5. We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, and expressed in the following paragraphs, in the sense of the ancient undivided Church :—

1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός) as the Beginning (ἀρχή), the cause (αἰτία), the source (πηγή) of the Godhead.

2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), because in the Godhead there is but one beginning (ἀρχή), one cause (αἰτία), through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.

3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son.

* *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference held at Bonn between the 10th and 16th of August, 1875.* Translated from the German of Professor Reusch, with a Preface by H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, London, 1876.

4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, who is the Image of the Father, issuing out of the Father, and resting in the Son, as the power radiating from Him.

5. The Holy Ghost is the personal Production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of the Deity, and utters the word.

6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is united to the Father through the Son.

Since this time there have been many interchanges of courtesy between the two communities, but nothing definite has been accomplished. Meanwhile political developments have done a good deal to bring England into contact with the East. We have become responsible for the government of Cyprus and Egypt; we have had much to do with Greece. On the other hand, political rivalry has a tendency to hamper relations with Russia. Yet something has been accomplished. The Archbishop's Mission to the Assyrian Christians has been a noble attempt to help unselfishly an ancient body of Christians sadly needing assistance. Various books have been published illustrating the history, the liturgies, and the present position of the two Churches. The Jerusalem Bishopric has been revived on a broader basis, in accordance with the wish and desire of the Greek Patriarch; and the consecration of the new English church at Jerusalem, in its architecture and services typically Anglican, one of the most beautiful buildings in Jerusalem, has put forward clearly and well the true Anglican position.

While there is this tradition of friendliness on the part of the English Church to the East, we ask naturally, What is the attitude of the East to us? The answer must be that there are there as here two parties. There are those who are friendly to us, and those who are the reverse. There are those who have some knowledge, and those who are ignorant. There are those who judge by such action

of ours as seems to be most typical, and there are those who have not unnaturally been prejudiced against us. There are those who minimise, and those who exaggerate, the differences between the two Churches.

It is, in the first place, well known that the Church of England definitely claims an historical position very different to that of Protestantism, and that the greater number of its members demand recognition on this basis. We are recognised as an ally in the controversy with Rome, for the Eastern Church is strongly, often too strongly, anti-Roman, and exhibits sometimes a strange nervousness which makes it reluctant to recognise what Rome may not endorse. Any approaches to friendship are almost invariably—unless some turn in the very crooked politics of the East intervene—received in the same spirit. The distinction given to the Archbishop of Finland in this country was no greater than that given to the Bishop of Peterborough or the Archbishop of York in Russia. There is also a very strong disposition on the part of many Russian theologians to recognise, or almost to recognise, our orders, but they are always a little afraid of committing themselves.* There is a great disposition for friendliness.

On the other hand, instances might be quoted of unfriendliness, suspicion, and ignorance. There have been something very like attempts to build up a Russian Church in America; there have been quite unnecessary and unreasonable cases of vilification; there are naturally movements and public utterances in this country which reasonably or unreasonably cause suspicion. We have many enemies who say what they can against us, and political feeling will often show itself in theological

* See particularly *The Question of Anglican Orders*, by A. BULGAKOFF. Translated by W. T. Birkbeck; published by the Church Historical Society.

rancour. And then behind all there is a fact to which we shall have to refer more fully later—that intense conservatism which a large number of circumstances have combined to produce in the Eastern Church, and which have made it, at any rate in appearance and feeling, one of the most unmovable of Christian communities.

The above historical survey will have brought out a very clear and definite line of policy on the part of the English Church. It has again and again during these centuries expressed its desire for friendship—a friendship which might lead to reunion—and it has felt that the existence of the Eastern Church is a strong support of its historical claims and position. The attitude of the Eastern Church has become increasingly friendly, but any movement for more than friendship on our part finds itself opposed to the uncompromising character of Oriental theology. At the same time there is a party in each whose tendency is to unfriendliness and even hostility. The grounds of friendship are the similarity of theological position, the causes of hostility partly certain theological difficulties, still more very obvious and deep-reaching dissimilarity of temperament and character. The next step in the investigation must be an inquiry into the main points of divergence between the two Churches.

Broadly speaking, both Churches appeal to Scripture and tradition, but the English Church asserts more definitely and strongly than the Eastern the sufficiency of Scripture for salvation, and the comparative indifference of the rites and ceremonies which cannot be definitely proved by it. Yet the difference is largely one of practice. If we take the *Longer Catechism* of the Russian Church we shall find little to object to. Revelation it tells us spread everywhere by two channels—Holy

Tradition and Holy Scripture. Tradition is the older, because Jesus Christ delivered His divine doctrine by word and example, not by writing; and the same method was followed by his apostles. "Scripture was given that divine revelation might be preserved more exactly and unchangeably." "We must follow that tradition which agrees with the divine revelation and with Holy Scripture"; but tradition is necessary "as a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministration of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution." So far generally we might agree, but the difference of attitude is really this. The Church of England has had to correct what it believed to be a corrupt tradition which had gradually grown up. It recognised, then, that only what could be proved by the oldest Christian documents handed down by the Church as inspired records of revelation could be held as necessary for salvation. But the events of the Reformation proved that Scripture was an uncertain guide, and led people into many strange places. It was quite clear to the historical student that a tradition must be older than the books of the Bible, and that the form and direction of Christian theology was older than any written record, and was imposed upon it by tradition. It was also clear that the earlier rites and ceremonies of the Church which represented an early and continuous tradition should not be departed from. But it was only too obvious that traditions had not been handed down in their original purity; it was necessary, therefore, to test traditions by the appeal to Scripture, by the appeal to history, and the appeal to the traditions of other Churches. The English Church appeals therefore to tradition and the undivided Church, but it is always with a sense of investigation. It believes that substantially its teaching

does represent a true and primitive position, but its history has warned it to be careful.

The Eastern Church has not changed in the same violent way, it has never had to investigate, it always has defended and asserted. It appeals, therefore, to the undivided Church, but it asserts that its teaching is the teaching of the undivided Church, that its traditions are the true ones. It has never learnt to be wary of the slow and imperceptible changes which gradually creep over any society and transform—it may be for the better, it may be for the worse—all its teaching and life.

There is, then, this fundamental resemblance. Both alike appeal to Scripture and tradition, or to formulate it more definitely, to Scripture and the undivided Church. And this very clearly and definitely in opposition to Romanism and as a corrective of the vagaries of an un-historical Protestantism. Speaking broadly, in their Creed and their Church Order the bodies would agree; but there is a difference in the fact that practically the Eastern Church lays a far greater stress upon tradition, and is very clearly confident that it possesses a true tradition.

When we pass to details the first point is that of the creed. We should hold, with the Eastern Church, that the standard of faith should be the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which in our communion service is called the Nicene Creed. So far we are agreed, but unfortunately when we examine it, the text of the creed as we use it is found to differ from that they use. The Easterns recite, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, who proceedeth from the Father"; the English Church, however, with the rest of Western Christendom, says, "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son." The point at issue is twofold. In the first place, it is contended that whether the addition was correct or not, it was made in an irregular way; in the second place it is contended by the Eastern Church

that the doctrine implied is erroneous, because it would assert two *ἀρχαί* or sources in the Godhead. On the first point the Eastern Church is absolutely right. The *Filioque* was added through a blunder by a provincial council at Toledo, and ultimately adopted simply on the authority of the Pope. The Council of Chalcedon, which finally promulgated the creed in the form in which it had been previously accepted, had also pronounced an anathema on any who should add to it. The addition, which has probably been a sign rather than a cause of the division between East and West, is, as was confessed at the Bonn Conference, irregular. An attempt has been made to define a point which the Church has never defined, which it will probably seem to most people very unnecessary that it should define. As to the irregularity of the addition, the error must definitely be admitted. It is another thing to condemn the West for heresy. — It is characteristic of the Eastern mind not to be content with that concession, but to feel it their duty to condemn the implied heresy which the words contain. But the point has never been defined by the Church, nor is there any reason that it should be. If the Eastern Church continue to insist in condemning not the addition but the implied teaching of the West, they are really implicitly guilty of doing what the Council condemns, of adding to the necessary articles of the Christian faith. The point has not been defined: it does not touch on any of the vital points of the Christian religion. We may let it alone.

It is sometimes forgotten that one of the main purposes of the appeal to antiquity is that antiquity did not burden the creed with unnecessary definitions. It condemned all who did so. But if we impose on others a dogmatic position, and define new points; if we condemn those who differ on some point outside the creed; if we condemn those who are quite willing to accept the creed

for an inferential heresy; we are quite as much untrue to the primitive Church as if we added new clauses. The doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost may be legitimate subject for theological speculation and pious opinion, but for us to seek to impose our opinion on the Greeks, or the Greeks theirs on us, is quite unnecessary. Where the Church has not defined, there the Church may differ.

A second point of difference is the sacraments. The Eastern Church declares somewhat vehemently that it is the Church of the Seven Sacraments; the English Church says that there are two sacraments only instituted by our Lord, and necessary for salvation. When we come to examine more closely we find, however, that the difference is not so great as appears. The Easterns would place the two sacraments on a different level to the rest, the English admits and occasionally calls sacraments other rites, the only one of the seven that she has not retained being unction. The number of seven sacraments has been referred to above. It is far later than the division of East and West; it is a Western doctrine which has crept into the East. The Eastern Church has built up its own system, very likely an admirable one, upon this basis. It is not our business to be too ready to condemn them; but so long as they appeal to the undivided Church with one breath, and with the next assert teaching as necessary which is clearly later in its dogmatic form and has no conciliar authority, and say that this question is not a subject for discussion, so long conferences are useless. The English Church may be wrong, but its error must be proved.

The same may be said about the use of the word *μετουσίωσις*, or transubstantiation. It is clearly part of normal teaching of the Eastern Church. A very acute observer writes:—

"I think there is an impression among us that *μετουσίωσις* is not a word in common use, but is rather esoteric. Whether or not it is absolutely synonymous with 'transubstantiation' may perhaps be open to question. But, however that may be, it is the common popular word, used in catechisms and ordinary books of instruction."

In Russia, also, we find the word used in the declaration of faith made by every bishop at his consecration:—

"Further, I do believe and understand that the *transubstantiation* of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is made, as the Eastern and Ancient Russian Churches teach, by the influence of the Holy Ghost."*

There is a large party in the Russian Church which contends that this is clearly not the same as the Roman *transubstantiation*. There are many who probably would be glad to get rid of the word. There is another party whose aim would be to emphasise the resemblance to Rome. But here again on the very presumption of the Eastern Church, there is a previous question. To give any sort of authority to the word is to violate the appeal to the undivided Church. The word was not used in this connection in Eastern theology until the twelfth century. It was introduced from a Roman source. It is quite clearly no part of the traditions of Christianity. Any insistence on the word or doctrine is untrue to the principles of the Eastern Church. The expression of sacramental belief should be not a dogma, but a service. The undivided Church has embodied its sacramental worship in a series of liturgies, varying in character, yet modelled on a common structure, and testifying to a definite tradition. Our appeal should be from dogma to liturgy, from theology to worship. The possession of a liturgy

* KING, p. 296.

adequately representing the sacramental ideals of the early Church is a reasonable demand. If all Churches, Eastern and Western, Roman and Anglican, were content with the sacramental expression of their liturgies, the reunion of Christendom would soon be far nearer than seems possible now.

The Eastern Church also asserts that it is the Church of the Seven Councils. It is, as always, perfectly confident. There are seven General Councils, and no more. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 states:—

“In conformity with the practice of the former conference, we declare that we are united under one Divine head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the Primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Œcumenical Councils.”

The whole question is, What are the undisputed Councils? There could be, I imagine, no doubt that the English Church accepts the first six, although she may lay (very naturally) greater stress on the first four. Her first synodical act under Archbishop Theodore was to accept the six councils, and it would be very unwise on any principle of continuity not to recognise this. But what about the seventh? The Eastern theologian is very fond of saying, “If you object to the Second Council of Nicæa, how do we know that you may not some day refuse to accept the first?” This is just one of those question begging sayings, which people who assume as axiomatic what they ought to prove, are very fond of. The real question at issue of course is—Is the Seventh Council Œcumenical? Has it been universally accepted? It is undoubted that immediately after it met it was condemned by the Council of Frankfort, at which the English Church was represented, and so far as I am aware no English

synod has ever accepted it. It was ultimately accepted in the East; in the West it had to wait for its formal acceptance until the Council of Florence, and it has several times been condemned by both East and West. When the acceptance is not clear it seems reasonable to demand that the matter should be a subject of discussion, and not that it should be dogmatically settled.

The decree of the Council is at any rate part of the teaching of the Eastern Church, and a study of it will show what is considered *de fide* in the nature of Icons. The Council begins by expressing its adherence to the decrees of the first six Councils; it then goes on:—

“And, to be brief, we affirm that we preserve all the traditions of the Church which have been handed down to us in her, whether written or unwritten, without innovation: of which one is the formation of representative images, as being perfectly concordant with the history of the Evangelical preaching, and helping to establish that the incarnation is real and not imaginary, and conducing no less to edification than the other. For those things which are mutually illustrative of each other have undoubtedly the same power of representation.

“These things, therefore, being so; as proceeding in the royal road and following the sacred doctrine of our holy fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church—for this we acknowledge to be from the divine Spirit that dwelleth in her—we, with all exactness and care do define that, in the same manner as the holy and life-giving Cross, so shall holy images, whether formed of colours or of stones, or any other material, be set forth in all the holy churches of God, and also on sacred vessels and garments, on walls and on doors, in houses and by the highways—whether images of Christ Jesus our Lord, our God and Saviour, or of our immaculate Mistress the Holy Mother of God, or of the holy Angels, or of the Saints and other holy men. For, in proportion as these are continually seen in images and pictures, so are the minds of the beholders aroused to the remembrance of and affection for their prototypes.

“And, further, we define that there be paid to them the worship of salutation and honour, and not that true worship

which is according to faith and which belongs to God alone. And in the same way as to the holy Cross or the sacred Gospels—so to these also shall be made offerings of light and incense, as was the pious custom of those of old. For the honour of the image passes on to the prototype, and he who worships an image worships in it the person who is represented thereby. Thus is confirmed the doctrine of the fathers—thus the tradition of the Church which in every place hath received the Gospel. Thus we follow Paul speaking in Christ and the whole company of the Apostles and Fathers, holding fast the traditions which we have received. Thus we write in the hymns which spake in prophecy of the Church, ‘Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Israel: be glad and rejoice with all thine heart. The Lord hath taken away (the wickedness of thine enemies): He hath redeemed thee from the hand of thine adversaries. The Lord thy King is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more, and peace shall be upon thee for ever’ (Zeph. iii. 14).

“Those who dare to teach or think otherwise, or after the manner of accursed Heretics to reject ecclesiastical tradition, or to imagine any innovations, or to cast out any of those things which have been brought into the Church—whether it be the Gospel, the type of the Cross, or any picture, or any relic of a martyr; or to reason perversely or craftily for the subversion of any of the legitimate traditions of the Church, or to use any of the precious things or of the sacred monasteries as profane things: if they be Bishops or Clergy let them be deposed; or if Monks or Laics, let them be separated from Communion.”*

This decree is very carefully drawn, for the Council was perfectly aware that the reverence for images was open to the charge of idolatry. The reference at the beginning to the Incarnation is difficult, but it really means that our Lord having appeared in the flesh, it was legitimate to make a representation of Him. The Eastern Church was afraid of any representation of the Father, the

* I have used the translation in MENDHAM'S *History of the Seventh General Council*, making one or two alterations.

Trinity, or the Spirit; but to Christ incarnate this prohibition could not apply; if we represent our Lord's human body, we imply that we believe truly in His Incarnation. Pictures then are to be allowed of the Second Person of the Trinity, of the Virgin, of Angels, and Saints. The essential point is that pictures teach and edify. Further, reverence may be paid them, but not worship; such it is explained as is paid to the Cross, or to the Gospels, and this reverence is merely relative. The sight of the picture or cross creates a remembrance of what it represents, and so makes us think of and reverence that. It may be very doubtful whether this decree admits or allows more than the natural feelings which we should all hold to be legitimate in Art. We should all defend the use of religious pictures as a means of instruction, and as stirring in us feelings of reverence, and referring us back to the ideas and thoughts implied in the subject or type. Reverence by means of candles and incense was a form of reverence which might be paid even to men: a bishop or an emperor might be revered and incensed. These were the customs of the day. All that the decree means is that real reverence is not idolatry. It does not make the use of incense and lights in any way necessary or obligatory.

Iconoclasm meant, it must be remembered definitely, iconoclasm. It began, no doubt, as a natural and legitimate protest against the very superstitious customs that prevailed. It began in moderation, but it had become a determined attack upon all Art in religion. It was largely justified by the excess of image-worship, but had it succeeded it would have banished Art from the Christian Church. It is quite true that, under the shadow of this decree, much that is superstitious and cannot be distinguished from idolatry has found a home. But many Easterns regret and have attempted to check this. We are not concerned to defend the common practice; we are concerned with

the decree, and that does not compel us to accept anything except what all Christians who make use of Art in worship would allow.

This same view is also clearly supported by the official teaching of the Russian Church. The use of Icons would, it is said, be idolatrous only "if we were to make gods of them": but "it is not in the least contrary to the Second Commandment to honour Icons as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's work and of His Saints; for when thus used Icons are books, written with the form of persons or things instead of letters."

Another very definite point of difference is the Invocation of Saints. "It must be frankly recognised that there is very little, if any, formal difference between Russian and Orthodox practice in this respect." That is true as to practice; it is not, I think, true as to theory. The Eastern Church does not believe in the merit of the Saints, but prays for them as they are themselves only saved by grace. It asks for the prayers of the departed as it asks for the prayers of the living, believing that they are cognisant of our prayers, and that they join with us in the great offering of prayer which the Church on earth and the Church in heaven pour forth before the throne of God. So the invocation is not confined to those technically known as Saints, but any of the departed are asked to join in our prayers. The child asks its departed mother to pray for it, and the following poem represents a father asking his departed children to pray for him:—

"Dear children, at that same still midnight do ye,
As I once prayed for you, now in turn pray for me;
Me who loved well the cross on your foreheads to trace;
Now commend me in turn to the mercy and grace
Of our gracious and merciful God."*

* KHOMIAKOFF, in *Russia and the English Church*, p. 2.

As it is only fair in this subject, as in the kindred subject of prayers for the dead, to allow the most rational writers of a Church to speak for it, the following extract from the writer Khomiakoff, whom we have already quoted, is given:—

“We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members.

“If anyone believes, he is in the communion of faith; if he loves, he is in the communion of love; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope on his own prayers, and everyone who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurance that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the Angels pray for us, the Apostles, Martyrs and Patriarchs, and, above them all, the Mother of our Lord; and this holy unity is the whole life of the Church.

“But if the Church, visible and invisible, prays without ceasing, why do we ask her for her prayers? Do we not entreat mercy of God and Christ, although His mercy preventeth our prayer? The very reason that we ask the Church for her prayers is that we know that she gives the assistance of her intercession even to him that does not ask for it, and to him that asks she gives it in far greater measure than he asks: for in her is the fulness of the Spirit of God. Thus we glorify all whom God has glorified and is glorifying; for how should we say that Christ is living within us, if we do not make ourselves like unto Christ? Wherefore we glorify the Saints, the Angels, and the Prophets, and, more than all, the most pure Mother of the Lord Jesus, not acknowledging her either to have been conceived without sin, or to have been perfect (for Christ alone is without sin and perfect), but remembering that the pre-eminence, passing all understanding, which she has above all God’s creatures, was borne witness to by the Angel and by Elizabeth, and, above all, by the Saviour Himself, when He appointed John, His great Apostle and seer of mysteries, to fulfil the duties of a son and to serve her.

“Just as each of us requires prayers from all, so each person owes her prayers on behalf of all, the living and the dead, and

even those who are as yet unborn : for in praying, as we do with all the Church, that the world may come to the knowledge of God, we pray, not only for the present generation, but for those whom God will hereafter call into life. We pray for the living that the grace of God may be upon them, and for the dead that they may become worthy of the vision of God's face. We know nothing of an intermediate state of souls, which have neither been received into the kingdom of God, nor condemned to torture ; for of such a state we have received no teaching, either from the Apostles or from Christ. We do not acknowledge purgatory, that is, the purification of souls by sufferings from which they may be redeemed by their own works or those of others ; for the Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, nor any sufferings, whatever they may be, except those of Christ ; nor of bargaining with God, as in the case of a man buying himself off by good works."

We have sufficiently in the preceding pages compared the teaching of the two Churches. Such discussion is always tedious and always necessary. So long as Churches differ, or have inherited differences, we cannot evade the problems thus created ; we have no right to save ourselves the trouble of minute and careful thought or investigation, even although the points may seem trivial, and the subject one which might have been avoided. Carelessness in theology, indifference to detail, indolence, a fear of exactness, do not harmonise, and never have harmonised, differences ; they only create them. The theologian who is really liberal will never be contemptuous of any subject which has divided human thought, although he may prove his ability by showing how near the reconciliation is.

But the difficulty between reunion does not really lie in these separate theological points, although they will have to be solved, but in differences of tone and temper, above all, in the whole attitude of mind exhibited by the Eastern Church. Whether in Greece or in Russia, the Eastern Church has for centuries had long periods of

isolation from the rest of Christendom. Its history, compared with that of the West, has been much more uniform. There has been no great development like Scholasticism, no great and violent change like the Reformation or the Counter-Reformation. It has really changed considerably, but the change has been slow and gradual, and so it has not been conscious of it. As a result of this, the ordinary attitude of the Oriental Church—more than that of any other—is to look upon itself as perfect, to assert that its rites and teaching have been absolutely unchanged since the apostolic times, and to demand absolute submission as a necessary condition of reunion. This has been illustrated for the last century in some extracts given above from the letters of the Patriarch to the Nonjurors; but if it is said that these extraordinary statements represent a period of ignorance, we can almost parallel them from the Encyclical Letter of the Eastern Patriarchs in answer to Pius IX., where it is said that everyone must agree “how impious and antysynodal it is to attempt the alteration of our doctrines and liturgies and other divine offices, *which are, and are proved to be, coeval with the preaching of Christianity.*” And Khomiakoff, who represents the most conciliatory spirit of his Church, writes as follows:—

“The Spirit of God, who lives in the Church, ruling her and making her wise, manifests Himself within her in divers manners; in Scripture, in tradition, and in works; for the Church, which does the works of God, is the same Church which preserves tradition and which has written the Scriptures. Neither individuals, nor a multitude of individuals within the Church, preserve tradition or write the Scriptures; but the Spirit of God, which lives in the whole body of the Church. Therefore it is neither right nor possible to look for the grounds of tradition in the Scripture, nor for the proof of Scripture in tradition, nor for the warrant of Scripture or tradition in works. To a man living outside the Church neither her Scripture nor her tradition

nor her works are comprehensible. But to a man who lives within the Church, and is united to the spirit of the Church, their unity is manifest by the grace which lives within her."*

The position represented here is quite clear and intelligible. It is, you must accept us and our Church, and look on its teaching as correct; if you do, you will have no difficulties; if you do not, you cannot understand us. The position is intelligible. It is perfectly natural to those who, growing up in their own Church, have always accepted it, but it offers no help to outside. It has often been said that you cannot understand a religion until you have seen it from within, and that there can be no real union until there is unity of life. You cannot amalgamate two Churches by sitting down and arranging their doctrines. But underlying the whole of the extract given, the assumption is made by the author that his Church is absolutely right. We have no difficulty about the relative authority of Scripture and tradition, if we are firmly convinced beforehand that the tradition of our Church is absolutely true, and that Scripture must agree with it, and therefore can always be interpreted as doing so. Yet there is another attitude of mind, one which necessarily arises in every thoughtful person, who looks not at one but at all the different branches of the Christian Church. He finds that there are many traditions; he finds that there are very different interpretations of Scripture; he is quite clear that every Church has changed, one in one way, one in another. To such a man these strong and dogmatic assertions are mere empty words. He has studied the history of liturgies, and knows that there has been a continuous if slow change. He knows perfectly well how the Eastern Church was influenced by the Roman in the seventeenth century, and that in that way came the Acts

* *Russia and the English Church*, vol. i. p. 198.

of the Synod of Bethlehem and the Orthodox Confession ; he knows how that influence has left its mark on the services. He knows how there has been a change in the temper and character of the Church since then. He can trace in the East, as well as in the West, change. He cannot accept the statements and assertions and traditions of the East alone. He may value them highly, he may believe that they are often sound and healthy, but he cannot help comparing and criticising, and exaggerated dogmatic statements only annoy him.

This attitude of the Eastern Church is, and will be until it is changed, the greatest hindrance to reunion. It thinks and says it has never changed. It says that the Church is infallible, and thinks that it is the Church. Until it will approach the points of difference between it and other communions in a different spirit—unless it is prepared, if necessary, to admit that it has been wrong, and that the Church of God is a far greater and wider body than its own community, and that God's Spirit has worked and worked with force and power in a far wider sphere, all real progress, anything beyond friendly intercourse (and for every act of friendship between Christian bodies we should be thankful), must be impossible.

Yet the existence of the Eastern Church is a very significant fact. It is, in the first place, a strong support of the position of the English Church. The Church of England has in the West the strength, but also the weakness of its position as a *via media*. It seems to many a very unreal compromise. It claims to be something different from the Protestant Churches, yet it is not Roman. Its position has been gained by a process which appears somewhat artificial. It is true that it can appeal to a long line of learned men, both its own and those attracted from other countries. The result of modern discovery does not make us in the least inclined to distrust

our position. But certainly in the West we are isolated. It is then a great gain to appeal to a Church whose claim to Catholicity, to a historical position, cannot be doubted, and which on the fundamental point is decisively on the side of the English Church. The point is (we may omit details), the acceptance of a position which implies the appeal to historical Christianity, which best preserves the traditions and Order of the Primitive Church, but denies absolutely the supremacy, the authority, and the infallibility of Rome. As against Rome, the East is far more vigorous and assertive than we are ; its controversy is not always wise or charitable, but both its position and its claims to that position are clear and decisive. On the other hand, in preserving the traditions of the Primitive Church on questions of order, organisation, liturgical worship, the traditions, the theology, it again takes the same line and attitude as the Church of England does, and that either against Rome or against what is commonly called Protestantism. There are differences. No attempt has been made to minimise or deny them in this essay. They are by no means unimportant. On some points one Church may be right, on some points the other. The Church of England has sufficient warning to caution it against any claims to infallibility. But, compared with the points of difference, the points of agreement are far greater and more important. The agreement is one of logical position ; the differences lie in the interpretation of that position. We need not press the agreement further than it will go, but we cannot be blind to its significance.

And not only have we the support of the Orthodox Church ; we have also indirectly the support of the separated communities. For although they are heretical (yet the extent of their heresies may in some cases be doubted), they have a definite value as historical witnesses. They witness, for the most part, to a time before they

separated. They may have been, to a certain extent, influenced since that time by one another, or by the Orthodox Church, but for the most part the relations have been those of isolation, even occasionally of repulsion. The points therefore of their agreement are of great weight; the points on which they differ, not as the result of their teaching, are equally instructive. And again, in the main lines of controversy we have the support of their historical evidence.

It is always difficult to know how arguments appeal to different minds, but to the present writer the argument against the claims of Rome, drawn from the history, the position, and the existence of the Eastern Church, seems decisive.

But there is another direction in which the Eastern Church seems to suggest a support to our position. We claim above all to be a National Church. That does not mean an adherence merely to some particular form of establishment. It means that, in its history and life, the Church is, or should be, bound up with the life of the nation, and that a National Church, while holding to all that is essential to Christian unity, may reasonably and rightly develop its own national customs—that its language should be the language of the people, that its customs and worship should correspond with the genius of the people. Christianity is so much deeper than any human expressions of it, that there will be a nearer approach to truth gained by each nation and people interpreting the message for themselves. We do not want a Procrustean system imposed upon all people alike. Now Eastern Christendom is the home of National Churches, and of National Churches which have played a great part in their national life. There are many criticisms, many just criticisms, which may be made on the Churches of the East, but it must never be forgotten that through all

the dark period of Turkish rule it was the Church which preserved the national life, and that inspired the movement for freedom. Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, Greece can all testify to this, and the only danger to nationalism has arisen when the Greeks of the Phanar have attempted by means of Turkish rule to transform the Holy Eastern Church into the Greek Church. But all evidence makes it clear that the national principle is the stronger; that it will be strong enough to stand against Russian as against Greek imperialism. The Russian Church, too, is essentially a national Church, bound up with the national life, and responding to the national spirit and character. The danger for the future is that the national Church may become an imperial Church, suppressing elsewhere as in Georgia national life. For Russia does not understand the principle of a self-governing colony, or of unity in diversity.

The Eastern Church can also give us valuable instruction. This lies, not in one particular point, but in the fact that it offers a very definite and distinct type of Christianity. A Russian writer, whom we have already often quoted, tells us that the whole of the West is under Roman influence. Our doctrines are Roman, or developed in opposition to Rome:—

“All the Western doctrine is born out of Romanism; it feels (though unconsciously) its solidarity with the past; it feels its dependence from one science, from one creed, from one line of life; and that creed, that science, that life was the Latin one. This is what I hinted at, and what you understand very rightly, viz., that all Protestants are Crypto-Papists; and indeed it would be a very easy task to show that in their theology (as well as philosophy) all the definitions of all the objects of creed or understanding are merely taken out of the old Latin system, though often negated in the application. In short, if it was to be expressed in the concise language of algebra, all the West knows but one datum, “*a*”; whether it be preceded by the

positive sign "+," as with the Romanists, or with the negative "-," as with the Protestants, the "a" remains the same."*

This is, of course, very largely true. All our Western theology is coloured by the influence of the Middle Ages. Mediæval Scholasticism was succeeded by Protestant Scholasticism. The Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith, the Zwinglian doctrine of the Sacraments, both arose out of opposition to the current Roman views. A whole series of questions which have never been raised at all in the East are discussed in the West. The controversies about works and faith, about Scripture and tradition, are not understood. It is not of course maintained for a moment that this difference between the East and West is altogether to the advantage of the East. The East suffers lamentably from a want of grasp of man's individuality, from a very slight realisation of sin, from an inadequate realisation of the Atonement. But if the East might learn much from the West, the West may also learn from the East. A correction to the rigid and mechanical theories of priesthood, which are sometimes held and always attacked among us, may be cited. There is no doubt a strong tendency among us to exaggerate the individual act of the priest, to suggest that it is the priest who performs Sacraments, the priest who gives the Holy Spirit, the priest who absolves. But the East reminds us that the priest is, after all, only the organ of the Church. "The Seven Sacraments are in reality not accomplished by any single individual who is worthy of the mercy of God, but by the whole Church in the person of an individual, even though he be unworthy." And this is illustrated in all their services. In the baptismal service it is, "M. or N. is baptised in the name of the Father," etc. Ordination is always by prayer.

* KHOMIAKOFF, *England and the Russian Church*, p. 67.

The ordinary form of absolution was always until the seventeenth century, and is still for the most part, a prayer. The Coptic office may afford another illustration, where the people, by responding all through the prayer of consecration, are associated definitely with the act of the priest. All these instances bring home to us how inclined we have been to exaggerate, whether in defence or attack, the office of the priest. A number of different elements have combined to direct our attention to this point in England. A more healthy and less exaggerated tone has crept over a great deal of our theology. Some of the most thoughtful and best of recent writings have brought out more and more for us the idea of the Church, instead of the idea of the priesthood, or rather the conception of the priest as the organ of the Church. It is certainly interesting to find that this is the normal theory implied in the traditions and services of the East. Here, as in other cases, we find that there is a third alternative between a mechanical theory of the priesthood and Protestant anti-sacerdotalism, namely, the priesthood inherent in the Church acting through its properly appointed ministerial organs.

There are other lessons of a similar character which might be learned. There is a further lesson. We have commented more than once on the extreme rigidity of the Eastern Church, on its assumption of absolute correctness, and its refusal to meet anyone except on its own terms. We are acquainted with the same phenomenon in the Roman Church. In both the position is absolutely untenable. The very tenacity with which the differences between the two Churches are held by each will prove to most minds the error of both. The spectacle is both sad and ridiculous if we see it in others. We should therefore avoid it ourselves. An assumption of Anglican or Protestant infallibility is just as absurd and just as untenable.

We cannot make other Churches be ready to learn from one another ; we can, at any rate, attempt to learn ourselves. Even if our beliefs, or actions, or practices are right and wise, we are certain to find on examination points in them which we have passed over, and which the perhaps erroneous opinions of others are able to bring out. There is no body of real Christians of whom we may not learn if we approach our differences with them in the true spirit of candid examination and a humble desire for knowledge.

We may conclude this survey, necessarily somewhat imperfect, of the relations of the English Church with the East by a few more practical suggestions. The first is as to our general policy. The English Church has no formal statement of its policy ; it has no general executive body. Yet there has been on this point a strong and consistent tradition, which has already influenced all the different parties in the Church, and has modified the actions even of those who might be considered most unsympathetic with it. Our desire is clearly and definitely to recognise the Eastern Church, to consider that in the countries where it is at home it is not our business to weaken its influence or to attach its members to our Church. This should become a definite rule of policy in either direction. It is quite independent of the moral defects of the Eastern Church. It is a very common habit for some English people to devote themselves to denouncing the moral and spiritual condition of the Church, especially that portion under Turkish rule. There are undoubtedly very grave defects. But what would our own Church have been if for centuries we had been subject to such conditions as the Eastern Church has endured? Should we have had the courage and tenacity to remain loyal to our creed? For generations in the East the one duty which the Church has been able to fulfil is to hand down to those that

came after its creed and traditions, to preserve if it is only the name of Christianity. It is natural that this should have inbred in them a conservative attitude which may have become too rigid. It is excusable if the laws which have forbidden them to extend their religion have often made them unspiritual. It is not for us to condemn or attack. We have far too many defects of our own. It is for us to help, but to help, not by making individual converts to our Church and further weakening Christianity, but by strengthening what is the hereditary Church of the country. A clear, definite line of refusing to be any party to proselytism, direct or indirect, should be our first rule.

The second is the cultivation of knowledge in a friendly spirit. The more different bodies of Christians know of one another, the less are they likely to preserve an attitude of bitterness. It is a condition of narrow isolation, combined with a regular system of proselytism, which causes bitterness between religious bodies. Knowledge, particularly personal knowledge, always tends to remove it. In this case both Churches are able to learn from one another. We can learn from them, for often their older, more conservative attitude will enable us to get behind some of our present controversies. They can learn from us if we realise that it is our mission to show how freely and reverently a Church may approach the different problems which modern thought and living arouse. It was our attitude of reverent criticism which attracted some of the most thoughtful members of the Roman Church; it is by being friendly to all other Christians who will accept friendship, and true to our own mission, that we shall do our part best for Christianity. Feeble imitation produces not union but contempt.

And then, thirdly, we can give actual assistance whenever that assistance may be possible. A body of Christians suffering from misgovernment, oppression, and spiritual

isolation may naturally require help which is given them in a friendly spirit. In certain cases, particularly where we are politically responsible, we can do that. And let us remember that it is worth doing for our own sakes as well as others. A Church which considers only the well-being of its own members, without caring for any missionary enterprise, at home or abroad, will ultimately suffer from spiritual death. A body of Christians which refuses to have any intercourse with other Christian bodies will become barren, and mistake its own prejudices, customs, and errors for gospel truths. By helping others, by intercourse with others, by studying and learning the life and history of others, we learn to brush away the cobwebs which are inclined to hide and disguise everywhere the reality of Christian teaching.

There will be much that is discouraging probably in what has been written, discouraging especially to those who are ardent advocates of Christian union, and have an idea that union with the East might come with great rapidity. Let us remember one fact which underlies all differences. It is that the fundamental truths of Christianity are held by all Christian bodies alike. The Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the historical facts of Christ's life are for us as for them the starting-point of our faith. A change in the present attitude can be brought about only by Christians agreeing to look at, to believe in, and to live up to what is essential, and is accepted by all as such. If they were to do so more sincerely, a very great change would rapidly come over the attitude of all Christian bodies to one another.

IX.

The Church and Nonconformity

By E. W. WATSON, M.A.

WHEN Christianity, in the ages which succeeded its foundation, first desired to become intelligible to itself, there was no need for the believer to frame a working hypothesis in explanation of the origin and nature of the society to which he belonged. He turned for enlightenment to a few passages in the Epistles and Apocalypse, of which we may take as typical the words of S. Paul, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." From such words as these he concluded that the Church had an existence of her own, and was not merely the aggregate of her members but anterior to them and greater than they; that she was, indeed, the first of all creatures, for whose sake the others were created. But if she be a mother, she must also first be a bride; and S. Paul and S. John had presented her in that aspect. And so we find an allusion to this belief in the *Didache*; and we find it naively and fully stated by Hermas. It is a familiar part of the teaching of Clement and Origen at Alexandria, of Irenæus in Gaul, of Tertullian, in both stages of his career, and of Cyprian at Carthage.*

* See, for instance, HARNACK'S note on *Didache*, xi. 11, and VON GEBHARDT'S on Hermas *Vis.* ii. 4; and O. EISSFELDT in *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1879, p. 577 f.

In fact, the mysterious, supernatural society into which he had been admitted was never absent from the Christian's thought. One Church, at least, that of Africa in the middle of the third century, was accustomed, in its baptismal profession of faith, to speak of "the remission of sins and life eternal through the holy Church." This belief, so far as we can trace its growth, may have become more precise; it had not become more intense or more comprehensive than in the minds of those who first held it. It inspired its possessors with a lofty patriotism and a confidence in their cause, which nothing could have engendered but the assurance that, though they might perish, it was eternal, in the past as in the future. And this Church was the visible body into which they had been baptised. The very literal, perhaps prosaic, mind of the early Christian made no distinction between an invisible and a visible Church; and faith was strong enough, in spite of blemishes, however obvious, to see the continuity of one Church stretching through the vicissitudes of time from a stainless past, in the purpose of God, to a stainless future. It was the unity itself, not the organisation or the ministry which were its expression, and to which it gave their meaning, that was the potent and ultimate fact.

Such, broadly stated, is the conception of the Church which found expression in her earliest literature, and has never ceased to be a power over her life; over the life and thought also of many, in all ages, who have separated from her. In logical Scotland, especially, though there has often been the quaintest contrast between the claimants and the majesty of their claim, the assertion made by each seceding body that it, and it alone, was the true Church, has added a dignity and an interest which nothing else could have given to the history of ecclesiastical conflict. But facts are too strong for inadequate theories

and in the face of existing divisions an urgent necessity has been felt throughout modern times for a new theory which might account for obvious disunion and justify those who were content to acquiesce in it. And because the Christian spirit has worked, and is working now, perhaps more strongly than ever before, in the hearts of those who are divided from the visible Church and from one another, the desire has arisen to make the most of such unity as exists and to convince the reason that unity of no other kind is possible.

This desire has found expression of late in the "Evangelical Free Church Catechism," a document of which no one can speak without warm admiration. It is, no doubt, the result of a compromise, and it may be that not all, or even none, of the societies represented by its authors will accept it for general "use in home and school." But its sincerity and piety are as manifest as the talent devoted to its production, and we may regard it as giving the best possible account of the principles it teaches. According to it the Holy Catholic Church, "though made up of many communions, organised in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, is yet One in Him," who is its Author; and "the essential mark of a true branch of the Catholic Church is the presence of Christ through His indwelling Spirit, manifested in holy life and fellowship." It is obvious that though all "Evangelical" societies are included in the definition, it contains nothing to discourage, and much to encourage, further division. Those who are discontented with their surroundings cannot be wrong in forming an association of their own, which is quite as likely—they would honestly think more likely—to answer the Catechism's description as that which they leave. And those whom missionary zeal impels to seek new modes of attracting the indifferent have nothing to lose, and may

gain much, by an independent organisation of their own. Whatever the motive of secession, the invisible Church is the gainer; the vine is richer by a new branch. But have existing congregations and societies, as a matter of fact, the consistency and self-denial to welcome such developments? And if they do, is not the apparent hopefulness based upon an underlying pessimism; upon the assumption that unity is hopeless, and we must make the best of division? All that is good in man tends to union; a recognition of "all the churches" means the despairing abandonment of the effort so to win the world for God, that its allegiance to Him may be manifest and unanimous. There is something of veiled Manichæism in holding that all mankind, body as well as soul, persons and offerings and organisations, refuses to be moulded into conformity with God's will. If we put a logical abstraction, however satisfactory to the intellect as an explanation of existing facts, in place of that conformity, distant as its attainment may seem; if we surrender the belief that it is possible because it is the purpose of God, and with the belief abandon the task of repairing the breaches, are we not acquiescing in the world as it is? And, after all, this theory is not satisfactory. As an ideal it cannot compare with that of unity, and it cannot face the logical assault of individualism. It is but a tentative explanation of existing evils, and can only aggravate them if it is used as a permanent justification of their existence. It is surely more Christian, while recognising frankly that for the present such harmony is impossible, and that misunderstanding and irritation would probably be the result of attempts at organic union, to remember always that union is good in itself, and therefore is an object never to be lost from sight. Nor can it be uncharitable to hold, while looking for and expecting to find much that demands our respect

in the members of such societies, that there must be something wrong where division is regarded as right. Indeed, we find so much that is good that we recognise in the division itself a sufficient cause for all that we could wish altered; and where so much justly demands our praise we cannot join in flinging an artificial sanctity over the outcome of past antagonism and present competition.

Let us test this definition of the Church as consisting of "many communions, organised in various modes," by the bearing towards it of what is incomparably the wisest and strongest polity among those concerned with this catechism, the Wesleyan Methodist. No religious society could be more coherent; its discipline is probably more perfect in control over its members than that of any other in Europe, unless it be the Orthodox Church of Russia. And with this discipline, and because of it, the society has been inspired with an admirable fervour. Statesmanship of a high order has been the cause of this double success. The body has always been regarded as greater than its members; the seed of future difficulties has never been sown by the ignoring of differences. They have been met and overcome, as in the memorable conflict when Bunting ejected Bourne. In this and in some other episodes there may have been a certain want of the Christian spirit; but we are now judging by results, and these have been eminently successful. The interests of Wesleyans have been concentrated upon the efforts and the triumphs of their own society, and they have had an ample scope. No religious body knows less of what goes on outside its borders; none of such importance is so little known by those outside. This limitation has, of course, had bad effects as well as good; but even these are evidence of the fact that Wesleyanism to the Wesleyan has been, not "one of the Churches," but the Church. The experience

of the most efficient of our voluntary religious bodies teaches us that not promiscuous approval of variations, but resolute loyalty to one cause is the secret of power; and its real spiritual success shows us, however imperfectly, what would be the action and what the victories of the ideal Church. The paradox of Wesleyanism is that its practice is so much better than its principle of association. If by the light of a half-seen ideal so much progress can be made, what might not be done if the same fervour and discipline were heightened and guided by the consciousness that they were employed in fulfilling the one divine purpose according to the one divine method!

But we cannot wonder that so shrewd a society ignores in practice the theory of a plurality of Churches. For there is no half-way house between unity, or such approximation to unity as may be possible, and individualism. There is a latent admission of this in the "Free Church Catechism," which becomes explicit in the writings of one of its authors, Dr. Fairbairn. In his *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican*, he tells us that the religion is the creative, the Church the created, idea.* St. Paul calls the latter "the mother of us all." Churches, we are told by Dr. Fairbairn, are only means to an end, and must submit to the utilitarian test of efficiency.† The historic Church, put to the test, is pronounced a failure. God, in fact, has ordained that men should be holy, but has not provided the sphere within which the holy life should be lived. The Church is not primary, a part of the content of religion, but secondary, a nation evolved in course of time, as religion grew self-conscious. Unity is not natural to the spiritual life and necessary to its perfection; such partial aggregations as may be formed are due to social contracts voluntarily made by individuals. This, I think, is a fair presentation of

* p. 32, and cf. p. 156.

† p. 48.

Dr. Fairbairn's thought, and it throws a light upon the whole mode of thinking of the English "Free Churches" and their members. It is essentially radical in its insistence upon the importance of the individual, and as essentially undemocratic. It is only Catholicism, in one or other of its manifestations, that can see the worth of collective humanity.

We may now turn to the Church as explained by individualism, and in particular to Dr. Fairbairn's book. Of its writer's metaphysical powers it is impossible to speak without admiration; we are forced to wish that we had him for our professional champion, in lieu of the unwilling and untrained conscripts who are forced too often to adventure themselves in that perilous arena. But we cannot equally admire his interpretation of history; and we must make a preliminary protest before we consider his main position against certain assumptions and arguments which do not strengthen him nor tend to conciliate an opponent. And first as to the assumption that "Catholics, Anglican and Roman," are sensuous in their worship; "sensuous sanctities" is a favourite phrase with Dr. Fairbairn. Without entering into the question as to helpfulness of the accessories of worship, we will ask him to remember that, beside the sensuousness which delights in splendour, there is a sensuousness which finds its satisfaction in austerity. In the domain of Art, one connoisseur may chiefly appreciate beauty of line, another, beauty of colour. In the domain of worship, practical experience shows that, for members of the English Church, there is little danger of attention being withdrawn by splendour from higher things; but there are quarters in which sensuousness of the other kind is a present and serious evil through the subtle pride which it engenders, as though a taste were a virtue. Again, while reason is praised, and not too highly, as transcendental and universal,

authority is scouted as the violation of law.* But reason allows, or rather bids, Dr. Fairbairn to express in the most Catholic terms the doctrine of the Incarnation.† Is it either more or less reasonable to take the rest of the Apostolic Creed in the sense in which it was used in the second or third century? And surely revelation implies a revealing authority. The Incarnation had to be manifested and recorded by authority before men could see in it the supreme expression of the reason and love of God. And lastly we must complain of a needless exaggeration of differences. To take one instance only, Dr. Fairbairn asserts that there are among Christians two opposite conceptions of Deity.‡ But let him apply a practical test. Let him take a few examples of the best spiritual literature of mediæval Catholicism and of modern Protestantism. The sincerity of the writers, and their veracity in recording what they have felt, will be above suspicion; and there will be the most obvious agreement between them. In fact, this concurrent testimony of pious souls is one of the most convincing as well as touching proofs of the oneness of the Faith. Is it not a darkening of counsel as well as a breach of charity when dialectical methods are allowed free course, without the salutary check of a comparison with facts?

And now for the consistency and adequacy of this view of Christian history. It necessarily begins with an absolute negation. Christ had no purpose of founding a Church. There is no evidence that He ever created, or thought of creating, an organised society. His kingdom

* p. 138.

† In the Free Church Catechism. But in *Catholicism*, p. 29, we are told that Christ is not a priest. From the point of view of the Incarnation this is meaningless. God could not be His own priest. There is, of course, a sense in which it is true, concerning which much may be learnt from Congregational literature.

‡ pp. 144, 146.

is without organisation, and incapable of being organised. This truth is so fundamental that the Catholic and New Testament polities are not only dissimilars but opposites.* But our writer is not content with historical statements, to which we must return; he fortifies his position by *a priori* considerations. Religion cannot be embodied in a Church, because it would then have to speak as a human institution. God must not be brought within the limits of a human institution: to use political distinctions, to circumscribe the society of God, is an unjustifiable interference with His modes of action.† God, in fact, is not free to do His own work in His own way. The conclusions we have reached compel us, on the one hand, to dictate conditions to Providence, and, on the other, to unlearn all that we had believed concerning the Incarnation. It is no longer a cohesive force; the Church, unorganised and incapable of organisation, consists of individuals, elect and insulated, even though choice or chance have caused them to cluster together.

But Dr. Fairbairn and those who think with him are too modern not to bring the principle of evolution to bear upon Christian history. Development there must have been, even though, as they hold, it has been by way of degeneration. There must, therefore, be an 'aboriginal germ—the idea and society of Jesus.'‡ We will not pause to consider whether that which is unorganised and incapable of organisation can be the germ of a society; we will follow the fortunes of the germ. We are agreed that it was supernaturally introduced into the world, and that its Author chose for it its environment. This being the case, we should assume that, making all allowance for the shortcomings of men, it would develop as it was meant by its Author to develop; that both its direct progress and whatever lateral pressures were exerted upon it would be such as

* p. 176 f.

† pp. 150, 200, 435.

‡ p. 189.

it was designed to make and to undergo. Thus, by a normal and natural development it would change, perhaps, considerably; and the change would be evidence that it was living and fertile, and adequate to the purposes which it was appointed to fulfil. If, on the other hand, the germ remained unaltered, we should condemn it as sterile and inert. Dr. Fairbairn, unlike ourselves, while he sees that the germ has grown, regards the growth as so distorted and perverted by the environment as to be different in nature from the germ out of which it grew. It is, of course, notorious that the general consciousness of Christendom sees not an unlikeness, but a resemblance so close as to be more than a resemblance, between the past and the present of the Church. But disregarding this witness, and treating the matter solely as a problem in evolution, let us ask what justification there can be for denying a sequence of causation on the strength of an unlikeness between antecedent and consequent. Is not a chicken unlike the egg from which it was hatched? The comparison is not unfair, since Dr. Fairbairn has treated the history of the Church as a natural one, and the value of the results he has obtained must be judged like any other attempt to apply the principle of evolution to the fortunes of men. The conclusion, which may or may not be true, that an effect is unlike its cause, cannot be regarded as an important contribution to the philosophy of history.

It is not worth our while to examine Dr. Fairbairn's statements concerning the history of the Church. He is not on his own ground. The metaphysical genius moves constrainedly in this field. Hume, because he was great as a philosopher, was small as a historian, and the nation of metaphysicians to which he belonged has not yet produced a history. Dr. Fairbairn has said what we should expect an advocate on his side to say. The Church is more modern than she believes herself; and she is a

failure, and therefore not divine. In making the first charge, he and his school rely upon the assumption, discredited in every other field of research, but rampant in that of historical theology, that a thing was new at the earliest date at which its existence has been detected. And they refuse to argue back from incontrovertible premisses to inevitable conclusions. We may indicate to them lines converging with mathematical certitude to a point which can be ascertained not the less surely that it is invisible; but they will not make the calculation. Disprove the assumption and override the refusal, and their school is disarmed.

There remains the charge that the Church is a failure. She has "proved her impotence."* Her history, in Dr. Fairbairn's hands, becomes a pathological demonstration. Failure, no doubt, there has been in abundance, of achievement and of character. But there have been also the *magnalia Dei*; and we must not forget that the Church has had to deal with the most complicated of problems and the deepest of feelings. In every department of human thought and conduct there has been failure as well as success. To take the most abstract of all, in which success ought to have been easiest, we may ask how much truth philosophy, dispassionately and irresponsibly arguing *in vacuo*, has ascertained with such precision as to gain a general acquiescence. All human effort is hampered by weakness, and weakness cannot be dissociated from sin; least of all in that sphere where man is directly concerned with the highest purposes of God. But, strange as it seems, the patience of God and the wilfulness of man are left out of the reckoning by which the Church is arraigned and pronounced a failure. The whole course of her history, it is assumed, can be accounted for without a Providence; purely natural causes have made her what

* p. 90, and cf. pp. 336, 343.

she is. But before we can accept this reading of history, we must be satisfied that the causes alleged are adequate to produce the result; and we are not satisfied. The method, we confess, is satisfactory when applied to episodes of the Church's history in which she has swerved from her true line of development. In Dr. Fairbairn's hands it accounts for Infallibility, and in hands as competent as his it would account for "the Churches"; it will not account for the Church, which is inseparable in thought from the Incarnation and whose history is unintelligible unless there be a divine Society among men. If that be the case, there is a logical coherence in the moral ordering of the world. Otherwise we must picture to ourselves two dazzling regions of the supernatural, that of God and that of the single human soul, and between them a dark belt of unrelieved naturalism; and we shall need to be on our guard lest we allow the middle zone to cast a shadow over the brightness of the others. Unconsciously, no doubt, but quite perceptibly Dr. Fairbairn has allowed his disbelief in the Church, as a sphere of the supernatural, to tone down the whole picture which he presents to us, till his readers must be tempted to doubt whether God, who withdraws His interest from so large a part of human life, can concern Himself with the welfare of single souls.

We have found grave reasons for difference with the school of which Dr. Fairbairn is one of the ablest representatives. Yet we cannot fail to be grateful to himself and interested in his writings, excellent as he is both in sweeping generalisation and in minute appreciation of character; and we must not complain that there is a middle region in which he is not equally at home. Now we must turn to a form of Nonconformity in regard to which all advocates of organised religion think alike. We need not fear lest Dr. Fairbairn will defend the spirit of "undenominationalism" against us; in fact, no sterner

language has been used against it than that of some Congregational leaders. It is true that their conflict with this spirit is somewhat of a family quarrel; but the practical working of the two systems is entirely different. An organised society or congregation, with a life and discipline and public opinion of its own, is on a level altogether higher than that of an undenominational mission, such as sometimes obtains support from half-hearted Churchmen. The aggregate harm done by such efforts, especially in the poorer quarters of our towns, is very considerable. They stand in the way of sounder work, and distract attention from it; the results they attain are ephemeral and their teaching is inadequate and often unhealthy. But they represent a tone of mind which, though it is not of the Church, is to be found in the Church. Its history dates back to the rejection by the dissenting societies of the friendship of Evangelical Churchmen. That friendship, so strong in the latter part of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth, created by the use of a common theological literature and by strong religious sympathy, was broken off by the political aggressions of the Dissenters. The Churchmen who could no longer work with them, and yet desired to be at home outside the Church as well as within it, turned from "interdenominationalism" (if the word may be borrowed) to undenominationalism. And the tendency was strengthened by the remarkable wave of Pietism—the word is used in a strictly historical sense—which led to the Plymouth secession; a wave whose forces are not yet spent.

Pietism, with a curious inconsistency, is as a rule both intensely, and often irrationally, conservative, and also exceedingly self-confident and even revolutionary. An acquiescence in the existence of evil, based upon the opinion that a Christian's citizenship is not of this world,

has been very common among Pietists, and has contrasted, not to their advantage, with the honourable, if sometimes unwise, activity in reform of organised Dissent. The same conservatism has marked their attachment to Scripture, or rather to certain portions of Scripture, which they have interpreted with what has seemed loyalty to their exact meaning, and have appropriated to themselves. Their revolutionary self-confidence has been shown in the abandonment or the undervaluing of religious ties and associations. Trusting in the value of their personal experiences, they have tolerated as indifferent the ordinances of a Society to which they still gave a nominal adhesion, or have isolated themselves, or have attempted to form a new and pure society of their own. This mode of thought, at its best, promotes a very pure and beautiful type of Christian life. But its dangers are obvious. If feeling be the ultimate test, there may be, and often has been, an assurance equally strong, and therefore equally valid, of sinlessness as of safety. And it is notorious that, among those who have started on this path, some have reached conclusions more unscriptural, if that be possible, than Perfectionism. But Pietism is even weaker as a bond of association than as a guardian of truth. For it is obvious that no one can be as sure of his neighbour's feelings as he is of his own; whence a certain suspiciousness is both necessary and right. And the tax upon feeling imposes upon the nerves a strain which they are not always able to bear; whence that apparently capricious, yet really natural, alternation of enthusiastic attachment and almost feline animosity which has sometimes disproved the claim to "spiritual-mindedness." In fact, Pietism has been at its worst when it has attempted to found an artificial Church, possessing the aggregate sanctity of its members. No history is sadder than that of the Plymouth Brethren, a body which, to our

discredit, was mainly formed by seceders from our communion. It is a history of such self-confidence as was described above. Self-centred and satisfied of their own sanctity, the Brethren in their first vigour made it their business to promote disunion in every quarter to which they had access. In their imperturbable self-esteem they mercilessly wrecked the work of others, then turned to quarrel among themselves, and finally fell through disintegration into merited oblivion; yet never doubted that, in some conventional sense, they were "devoted" and "spiritually minded" persons.

These various evils of unnatural isolation, of artificial union, and of indifference to order have arisen through an overgrowth of the personal side of religion, which has led to a lack of humility and to dissatisfaction with the providential government of the world. It has seemed easier to cut the knot than to take a modest share in untying it; easier still to declare that the knot does not exist. In those who have not learnt that there is one Church, divinely founded and fulfilling its purpose, however impeded in its task by the unworthiness of its members, it is natural enough that such thoughts should rise. In Scotland, especially, where barriers insuperable, though impalpable, separate Presbyterians, and frustrate their desire for sympathy, the need has made itself imperiously felt. For men must have an ideal; and here is an ideal with much in it that is attractive. Hence the revivalism of twenty years ago, with its practical denial that God concerns Himself with anything but single souls; hence such an institution as the China Inland Mission, the promoters and missionaries of which deliberately act upon the principle that all modes of organisation are equally right and equally unimportant, and are indifferent to the confusion in which their converts must be involved in the future; as though God were not

a God of order, and did not desire to be the Master of the whole life of man.

Such movements as these, animated by obvious piety and rewarded with considerable success, draw much of their support from Churchmen. Still, they are not Church movements, and might be regarded as not directly concerning us. Of late years, however, the ideas of which they are expressions have widened their range of influence. The Keswick Convention especially has become a power which we may to some extent estimate by the space given to it in the recent *History of the Church Missionary Society*. The entry "Keswick Convention" in the index to that work occupies a space greater than is allowed to some missions to which three generations have devoted their lives and their deaths; and many facts of interest and importance have been omitted in the third volume of the history in order to make room for this extraneous subject. In this amplitude of treatment we may perhaps recognise an admission that the movement needs an apology, or at least a recommendation. It is, indeed, well known that many of the Evangelical clergy condemn it, and many ignore it. But its partisans are numerous and zealous and increasing, both among the missionaries of this great society and among its supporters at home; and it must be taken into account in any consideration of the forces external to the Church which are exerting an influence upon her. But very few words will suffice. The movement had its origin among those, within and without the Church, who were nearest to "Perfectionism," and though the leaders, through natural good sense and the gravity of responsible position, can be trusted to refrain from erroneous teaching concerning sinlessness, yet premisses are there supplied from which the perfectionist conclusion is too often drawn by younger and less balanced minds. The sober teaching of the Islington College, whence the

Society draws many of its recruits, is above suspicion; but other influences are at work. Dangerous lessons, which are not those of the Church, are being taught here and there in the mission-field, and it would be worth the while of the authorities of the Church to inquire whether there be not a certain prevalence of Perfectionism among junior curates, even in England.

This movement, which cannot be dissociated in character or effects from several others, slightly earlier in date, which it has eclipsed, is simply the revival of a Pietism or Quietism such as has appeared and disappeared in many ages. It is all sincere, and much of it is beautiful, but it has made no contribution of permanent value to Christian thought. The literary outcome of this whole tendency in Britain and America is, indeed, so poor as to be a condemnation in itself. It may be too young to have produced any serious work of thought or argument, but we might have expected from it an outburst of poetry. But poetry represents the fusion of reason with emotion; and in this case, though strong emotion has not been wanting, a copious hymnody has been conspicuously void of the qualities which distinguish poetry from verse. The tendency has done nothing to enrich or elevate Christian thought; it has suggested no topic of strength or consolation which was not as fully present to the more ordered minds of the older Evangelicals. There is, in fact, nothing to distinguish this mode of thought from many which have preceded it, except a certain courage in its latest developments in stratifying (if the word may be used) its adherents; those who have undergone some experiences, which we will not describe by the names they bear in its literature, being confidently assigned to a higher level than that of their fellow Christians. It offers nothing to compensate for the mischief it is doing in relaxing the ties which

hold the Church together, for it has no sense of the importance of what is specifically Christian in ordinance and discipline; given an indefinite number of units and a certain amount of light, a satisfactory pattern, as in a kaleidoscope, will be the result. We cannot wonder that disintegration has spread wherever such teaching has made its way; and, in particular, that a considerable number of devout persons of both sexes have, during the last thirty years, left our Church in a direction which those who are not curious of minute differences may be content to describe as that of Plymouth.* But, beyond the injury of direct losses, these tendencies and their antecedent sympathies inflict a deep wound upon the Church. The great majority of its members are content with it, and seek no edification or encouragement from without. But one group of its members, and only one, refuse to be Churchmen, and nothing more. If they would but satisfy their needs within the Church, even by becoming an exclusive *ecclesia in ecclesia*, they would exert an influence, to the benefit of the whole body, which cannot be theirs until they are willing to abide contentedly within their home.

We have now considered the two forms of individualism in religion which chiefly affect the English Church, and have found that the organised, in proportion as its organisation is Church-like, is more effectual for good than the unorganised. Its theory may not be more satisfactory, its ideal not more inspiring than that of the other, but practically it is a force powerfully co-operating with our

* An experienced missionary of the Church Missionary Society, explaining at great length in the *Record*, during the autumn of 1899, his secession from the Church, assumes as the basis of his argument that only individual souls are of importance, and that, when a number are converted, God has no further purpose in regard to them as a Society. It is wrong, therefore, to organise them according to the methods of the Church of England, the Baptists, or any other Society, none being more divine than another.

own. And we are confident that this force can be fully exerted, not by stretching an abstraction into tenuity, but only by recognising and pursuing the same ideal with ourselves—that of one great Christian Society divinely planned and visibly organised. As we see it now, this Society has many faults and many divisions, much evil within and much good apparently outside. But we cannot doubt either that this good could find a place for its beneficent activity within the Church's ordered life, or that it would be wrong for us to abandon our ideal. It is often difficult, we confess, to reply to arguments and objections, and we may err in the details of our explanation; but the difficulty is part of our probation, and the worst explanation of the purpose of God is better than the best method of explaining it away. We are here on our trial, moral and intellectual; or rather, in such matters as this, the intellectual merges in the moral. We have received from above, not conceived for ourselves, the idea of a universal Church, the true sphere of the whole life of man. We can account, by what we know of human nature, for all its failures to extend its borders and to establish its influence over its members. We cannot account for the idea itself, for the Society which is its embodiment, for the unity, in spite of diversity, which we recognise in those outside the Society's corporate life who have the Christian spirit. And there is one intellectual test which this idea, and it only, can endure; it offers a sufficient scope for the imagination. To take one thinker only as an example. Could we conceive of individualism, whether unconcealed or masked by the guise of federation, as inspiring Coleridge?

The outline, then, is furnished for us; it is ours to fill in the picture. Great spaces are blank as yet, and much that has been drawn needs to be obliterated. As many centuries may be needed to correct the task as have been

spent in designing what often has been no better than a caricature, and the best that has yet been done is as nothing compared to future possibilities. What these may be we are not concerned to know. Ours is the humble task of holding fast what truth we have, and never despairing of the ideal. We are Englishmen, and like it none the worse that it does not lend itself to rhetoric or to logical demonstration. We know by experience that a proof may be too conclusive to convince, just as a feeling may be too intense to be trustworthy. Our position towards Nonconformity is that which Dean Church has eloquently described in the last chapter of his *History of the Oxford Movement*, in regard to the great cognate controversy with Rome—a resolute and serious appeal to facts. We recognise the revealed ideal, and we see that for us and our nation it is embodied in the English Church. We must go on our way, setting forth the truth as we have received it, appropriating it to ourselves, and illustrating it in our corporate life. We recognise the Spirit of Christ conspicuously working in many members of many denominations, and working, because they have devoted themselves to Him, through the societies to which they belong. We will make no aggressive attempts to proselytise, and suggest no unwelcome schemes for organic union. But we are sure that, great as would be our gain from union with so much piety and wisdom, it would be far outweighed by the gain to those who should join our ranks—the gain of freedom and power that comes from the consciousness of working, not in self-chosen confines, but in the appointed field of all the redemptive activities of Christ.

X.

Education

BY H. A. DALTON, M.A.

I.

IT is hardly possible to frame any intelligible conception of the Church of Christ in which a prominent place should not be given to the duty laid upon her, and the authority given to her, to educate her own members, and through them the world. Her divine Founder's commission to her imposes the nucleus of a creed as the condition of Baptism, and bids her teach the baptised to "observe all things whatsoever He commanded" His apostles. A creed and a discipline are alike essential properties of the Church.

The history of the divisions of the Church is the record of disputes as to the precise contents of the essential creed, the locating of the authority which is to determine them, the limit of their development; or again, as to the rigour and exactness of her discipline, the possible variations of its demand in different parts of the Church, the need and the divine sanction for a central authority on earth to rule the whole body. But all Christians who believe in a visible Church at all must agree that there are some fundamental truths, some necessary rules or methods of discipline essential to her existence, and that the Church, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth,"

is authorised and is bound by some means or other to teach the former and to maintain the latter. It is certain, therefore, that the Church is an educating body, and that any part of the Church which left education out of its field of operation would be disobedient to the Founder of the Church, and would be risking in a very serious degree its claim to be a part of the Church at all.

1. The Church, then, is first a teaching body. She is responsible for "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." She has a historic creed, which has come down to Christians of the present day with the sanction of ages, an authorised statement of definite facts, supernatural but historically attested, and of inferences from those facts as to the Being and the modes of operation of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. This creed she is bound to teach to her own children. She cannot, without disloyalty to Christ, surrender this duty to any other organisation. She cannot be content with any compromise which should pledge her to withhold part of the essential truth. She is bound to insist on full liberty to teach the whole of the Christian creed, and, having that liberty, she is bound to make use of it. Whatever be the conditions under which, as things stand, the Anglican Church may best secure and use such liberty, she cannot lose sight of this foundation principle.

2. But, secondly, the Church must not only teach, she must also train her children. There is a discipline as well as a creed. The discipline will follow the lines of the creed. It will be the means by which the truths formulated in the creed will become the stimulus and the sanction of the moral life. Christian faith thus becomes a reality to Christians; it is thus seen that it "is not a formless impulse; it is self-surrender to a corporate life ruled on a definite model of religious and moral teaching."*

* GORE, *Romans*, p. 234.

The "building up of the Body of Christ" is designed to further "the perfecting of the saints." If the creed registers the necessary truths, the discipline of the corporate life of the Church trains and develops the character of each of her baptised members. This function of the Church is, or should be, made effective in her missionary influence upon the whole world. It should operate during the whole life of each Christian. But not least has it to be displayed in the education of the young, and that in two ways, which may perhaps be distinguished as being respectively ethical and devotional.

It is an idea too common in the popular mind that morals may be dissociated from theology, that it is possible to instil the principles of conduct without reference to theological truth. The Church cannot accept this; the Christian teacher knows that there cannot be a more fatal mistake. The great social duties of purity, truth, and honesty are indeed recognised in some degree as duties by the conscience of all men, with or without the sanction of revealed religion. But it is written in bold lines all across the history of mankind that the appeal to conscience depends for its practical force upon those sanctions, and upon aids which come from a higher source than human nature. "*Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor*" is, broadly speaking, the universal witness of the human heart unassisted by grace; and the lesson of the decay of the ancient civilisations ought to be a sufficient warning against any attempt to divorce morality from religion. If such a divorce could be successfully attempted, for a time and among the nobler spirits the tradition of Christian morality would linger on, but were the restraints of religion completely swept away, no theories of self-interest or self-respect or love of mankind apart from God could stem the force of human passion.

"The paradise of materialism," it has been finely said, "will lie open before what we shall be told is emancipated humanity. The fiery sword of old terrors that, flaming and turning every way, deterred men from entering there, will have been snatched from the hands of superstition by science, and the multitude will rush in to eat, or strive to eat, and will make of that paradise what satiated lust, or unsatisfied desire, has made of other paradises from the first—a hell upon this earth."*

The Christian educator knows that no morality will stand against the power of temptation which is not rooted in the holiness of God, and that no discipline can raise a man's character to its highest power which does not bring home to him the sense of sin through the sacrifice of the Cross, and the knowledge of a supernatural power in the continual presence of the Risen Christ through the operation of the Holy Ghost. The consciences of the young are sensitive, and their aspirations generous. The Church of Christ cannot offer to them a weaker sanction than the judgments of God, a lower ideal than the example of Christ, or a less effective aid to its realisation than the power of the Sacraments.

It follows from this that the discipline must also have its devotional side. The Church must be free to train her children in the habits of prayer, to keep alive the communion of the soul with God. She must teach them what it means to be regenerate in Holy Baptism; she must give them the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation; she must lead them on to realise the power for holiness that is given by Holy Communion. To all this the Anglican Communion is deeply pledged. Her rules of discipline may be less rigid, less imperatively forced upon the conscience than those of that part of the Church with which the idea of discipline is more

* Sermon preached by Bishop Magee at St. Mary's, Oxford, October 30th, 1881.

readily associated. But if she allows more liberty of conscience in matters of detail, if she rather offers ideals to the view than insists upon particular methods of pursuing them, this is not because a lower type of character is aimed at, but we may venture to say a higher. The genius of Anglicanism is to apply the Pauline view that the gospel, once given, does not need the buttress of the law. It holds that the Christian law of liberty is best attained upon a system which is largely voluntary, and that the dangers—not to be ignored—which attend such a system are less than those which are involved in a peremptory and exaggerated insistence upon obedience to external rule. But we do not herein lessen the value or the necessity of a devotional discipline in education. To train a young life into the pursuit of high ideals and the observance of holy habits, to accustom it to self-denial, to prayer, to public worship, to the devout use of the Sacraments, is an essential feature of the Church's educational work. If much is left to the individual conscience, if there is less attempt to force an entry into the secrets of the individual soul, it is all the more necessary to bring personal influence to bear upon her children for the inculcation of high principles, and in leading them to rely directly upon God Himself, revealed in Christ, and uplifting them by His sacramental grace. As therefore the Church demands freedom to teach her creed, so she cannot be satisfied with any system of education for her children which does not secure that the educators are Christian men or women.

3. We are now in a position to consider what is the attitude of the Church as conceived by the spirit of Anglicanism towards secular education. The term, as being in popular use, is used here, but it is not satisfactory, for the noun has to be employed in a narrower sense than the true. When we are dealing with secular

things, things of this life, there is no room for training the will or the character, except so far as the character is indirectly affected by the development of reasoning processes. Education is here confined to instruction, the giving of information, and the training of the reason and memory. Its sphere is knowledge, not character. And the epithet itself, while it conveniently expresses the distinction between theological instruction and instruction in "the things which are seen," which "are temporal," can be used by a Christian only with a mental reservation. For in strictness nothing is purely secular, confined in its origin and its purpose to the temporal sphere. S. Paul has taught us that "the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity." Natural religion thus implies the truth, which becomes explicit in revealed religion through the Incarnation of the Word, that everything which can become the object of human knowledge is rooted in and reflects and leads back to the mystery of the Being of God. The study of theology is, it is true, in a special sense, the study of God Himself and His revelation, but it is not thereby dissociated from other studies. Rather, as has often been pointed out, theology is the queen of sciences, that in which such explanation is found as is possible to man of the mysteries which underlie all sciences and baffle all inquirers. All branches of human knowledge are related to it. If theology is the study of God, natural science is the study of God's works. It cannot proceed to its wonderful discoveries without continual ventures of imagination, leaps into the unknown, which are identical in process with the act of faith. It can only proceed to a certain point, and must for ever stand baffled before the mystery of life, which comes from God. Metaphysical science can

formulate theories as to the relations of mind and matter, subject and object; it cannot penetrate to the cause of the existence of either. The science of language can investigate the laws according to which human thought finds expression; it cannot reveal the origin of human speech. History can store the memory with incident; it can train the understanding to grasp the laws of the growth and decay of nations; but the causes which it can trace are only mediate; it finds its own explanation only when it is realised that the truth, which becomes explicit by the aid of inspiration in the Old Testament, underlies it all, and that the story of mankind is the story of God's judgments and providential dealing. Art and literature suggest the same lesson, that truth and beauty in the works of human genius are reflections of the goodness of God, and become debased in proportion as their authors are severed or sever themselves from the highest conception open to them of the divine beauty, and degrade their genius to the baser uses of human life. Truly "God reveals Himself in many ways," and the Christian teacher will always have it at the back of his teaching that all "secular" knowledge is summed up in the revelation of the Incarnate Word, and that the pursuit of truth in any sphere must, if the intention be pure, and truth be sought for truth's sake, ultimately lead up to the glory of the true God.

It follows that the Church of Christ, holding in her creed the key to the ultimate explanation and ultimate basis of all knowledge, must welcome all inquiry into truth of every kind. If she is true to her title of "Catholic," she must be catholic in the breadth of her sympathy with human speculations and human discoveries in every branch of inquiry. She must be fearless in her conviction that the advance of knowledge will in the long run serve the glory of the God in whom she believes, the Creator alike

of the object of knowledge and the faculties of the human mind. The Church is, as an organisation, responsible for the deposit of faith, and this includes the crowning truth into which all others run up. She is not in a similar way responsible for the steps by which those other truths are reached, sometimes in a patient and a sure advance, sometimes by the ways of error, after long wanderings in pursuit of false and misleading lights. The Church should therefore be very patient even with wild speculation in the sphere of human knowledge. Whatever is obscurantist involves mistrust of the providence of God, a practical disbelief in the unity of knowledge and the universality of revealed truth, and is therefore in fact uncatholic. It is not, of course, contended that the authorities of the Church have always acted upon this principle. But wherever they have failed to do so, the failure has brought its own punishment. Repression of opinion cannot repress the truth, and when a theory, once dreaded, has taken its rank as an established truth, the earlier attempt to crush it on theological grounds has recoiled upon the heads of its authors. The abandoned error, stormed by criticism or science, is found to be after all no outwork of the faith. It was not worth defending, but the attempt to defend it has provoked an unnatural hostility between science and Christianity, has lessened the authority of the Church in that sphere which properly belongs to her, and has weakened the force of her appeal to the conscience and intelligence of mankind. *E pur si muove.*

4. Is there anything in the history and spirit of Anglicanism which may suggest that English Churchmen who are educators have here a special opportunity? It may be contended that there is. The Anglican presentment of Catholicity, rightly understood, may steer us between the rock of blind adherence to tradition for tradition's sake, and the whirlpool in which the mind is swept helpless

upon conflicting eddies of unguided speculation. With her appeal to Scripture and to history on the one hand, her adherence to the creeds of the undivided Church on the other, the Anglican Church has a unique opportunity for Christian education, in which the fearless pursuit of truth may be combined with a truly Christian temper. What is special to her is due historically to criticism, to the breaking of bonds unlawfully, as she believes, imposed by a tradition which had grown up in days of ignorance. Whether or not she can rightly claim to be a learned Church in fact (and she boasts names in the century now closing which it is hard to beat in the department of theological learning), it is certain that her appeal is to learning. She welcomes the light. She does not fear criticism. The spirit of obscurantism is opposed to her genius. It is recognised that theologians as such cannot claim to control the methods of inquiry in other departments of learning than theology. Science and history and literary criticism must work out their own results in their own way. The Christian educator, with his feet firmly planted on the rock of the Incarnation, will welcome light from every quarter, and encourage all free and patient inquiry, secure that all will tend at last to a clearer and wider view of the bearing of Christian truth upon all that human learning can explore. The true function of the Church in relation to secular instruction is not to undertake it herself, as an organisation, not to fear or repress any free inquiry; but to secure that teachers and taught are themselves Christians, and approach all human studies in the Christian temper. Other organisations may instruct; the Church must undertake the higher work of educating, training the character to reverence and patience and humility, so that all learning and all instruction may be pursued in a felt dependence upon God revealed in Christ.

5. It is necessary here to guard against a misapprehension. When it is said that the spirit of Anglicanism, which became conscious of itself during the Reformation period, is opposed to obscurantism and favourable to a liberal education, it is not implied that education is due in England to the Reformation. It has been shown quite recently by Dom Gasquet in his *Eve of the Reformation*, and by Mr. Leach in his *English Schools at the Reformation*, that this is not the case. The latter writer has marshalled an array of instructive facts which prove that the Council of Edward VI. were despoilers rather than founders of schools. It is to be regretted that he has not given us a list of those schools which were, in the early days of Elizabeth, really new foundations out of property which had not been in the past devoted to education. But he has shown conclusively that under the auspices of the Church before the Reformation the country was well supplied with schools in proportion to the population, and that by the rapine and mismanagement which marked the Reformation movement at a particular point of its long and chequered course, a unique opportunity was lost of organising national education, with the result that the supply and efficiency of schools throughout the land was not increased but substantially diminished. Dom Gasquet's work is equally interesting and instructive, but, as a controversialist, he seems to miss the point at issue. He brings the artillery of his great learning to bear upon the theory that England was wrapped in an utter darkness until the day when Katharine of Arragon was divorced; and that, so soon as men's minds were liberated from priestly superstition by the disowning of the Pope's supremacy, the light of learning was kindled and filled the land. The revival of learning, he shows us, preceded the Reformation, and in the Reformation (as has just been noted) was for the time being checked. No doubt; but

is the view which Dom Gasquet combats held by any person who has sufficient intelligence and education to induce him to read the book? The real problem surely is to find not the effects but the causes of the Reformation movement. The New Learning grew up under the fostering care of the Church; its exponents were devout Churchmen. The invention of printing made its results and methods accessible to a widening circle of students, all of them in full communion with the Church. When the quarrel with Rome in high places came—no matter now with what motive—when foreign Protestant influences, which had grown under similar conditions and had led to even more startling results, found their way into England, the national revolt against tradition and against Rome, the seat of tradition, took place. Not the despotism of a tyrant, not the persecution of Mary, not even the feeling under Elizabeth that the national existence was at stake, not one of these alone nor all together can account for the English Reformation. In England as elsewhere the movement grew within the Church herself. Rome was defeated, so far as she was defeated, by weapons forged within her own armoury. The lion had suckled the whelp that turned and rent her. Where a scholar like Dom Gasquet tells us that the time has not yet come for a full explanation of the Reformation movement, it would be presumptuous to hazard one. But the more convincingly it is shown that the Church in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was the mother of education, the clearer it becomes that here is the problem to be solved. The Reformation was not forced upon Northern Europe by hostile powers external to the Church; it grew within the Church herself. Why, when circumstances favoured a revolt against Rome's power, was a state of feeling found to exist which rendered it possible for the Church in England, while retaining, or, we will say for the sake of

argument, professing to retain, her continuity with the past, to reject not only what she had long regarded as abuses of Rome's authority, but that authority itself, with so much of the tradition which had for centuries been received, without question in the popular mind, as truly Catholic?

"The Reformation," it has been said, "was an incident in the Renaissance." It was the form taken by that far-reaching movement when the revival of learning and a broader outlook upon the world began to produce its effects among those Northern peoples whose leaders of thought were deeply interested, not in art, but in religion, and were determined to understand and therefore ready to criticise the grounds of their belief. The increase of secular knowledge and the return to the study of the Bible produced a revolt against the authority of the very Church which had fostered such knowledge and study. Was there perhaps a feeling, gradually forcing itself into consciousness, that authority had been overstrained, that theology, while it fostered the places of secular learning, was attempting unduly to control its methods and was afraid of its results, that the parent was keeping too long in leading-strings the children who had learned, through the education she had given, the ambitions and the powers of their own God-given faculties?

It is not contended that the Reformation movement was through all its course and in all its incidents an unmixed blessing; but the view deserves consideration that its excesses, its heresies, its wild speculations, the obscurantism to which, in its turn, it was liable, were made possible by a narrowness of view and a failure of insight on the part of the authority against which it was directed. If the Renaissance as a whole, when all allowance is made for its excesses, was a liberation of the human spirit, and led to a broader and truer understanding of the world, then the Reformation as a whole, while certainly it was

not the cause, was perhaps one of the effects of that deliverance.

It may be thought that this discussion has been a digression from the proper subject of this essay. But its object has been to illustrate what has already been suggested, that the spirit of Anglicanism, with its adherence to Holy Scripture, to the Creeds, and to genuine Catholic tradition, and its encouragement of free inquiry in all branches of human knowledge, is exactly what is needed for the best possible education. For in this spirit the balance will be kept between authority and speculative liberty. All light will be welcomed from every source. In every subject the specialist will freely investigate and freely teach. It will be believed and it will be shown that all human knowledge will lead to the fuller manifestation of God's truth. The teacher and the taught will possess their souls in patience and wait upon God. They will do their work in that reverent and devout temper which is fostered by the Sacramental life.

II.

1. It is an ideal picture. It might have been realised to-day if the Church in England had always risen to the height of her opportunities, and had been true to the spirit in which her formularies are conceived. As it is, she is hampered by her own past, and hindered in her work by forces alien to herself. The Church ought to be the educator of the nation. In the full and proper sense of the expression, this would only be possible if the Church embraced the whole nation, if Church and State were not merely linked to one another by constitutional bonds, but, as in the age before the Reformation, actually one in respect of the persons comprised in each. But when this ceased to be the case, and sects fell off from the Church, new problems became inevitable. During the nineteenth

century two concurrent factors have forced these problems into prominence. The first is the final triumph of the principle of toleration in religion, the second is the general and increasing desire for secular knowledge. If all religious bodies were equally ready to make sacrifices for their own special tenets, not less desirous to train their children under the influence of Christianity as they conceive it than to guard them from religious influences which they distrust ; or again, if all persons who desire to have their children educated were able to take the highest view of education, and to regard it as a training of the whole being, mind and heart and will, not only for temporal success but for eternal perfection, the solution of the problems offered by religious division might be comparatively easy. It is difficult in part because the religious spirit and strong moral temper of the English people is combined with a widespread indifference to religious forms, and in part because, by vast numbers of people, education is regarded only as the means of giving to children such mental furniture and such a stock of useful knowledge as will fit them to enter with success into the fierce competition of life. For the latter reason it is always necessary to be pressing home the truth that education is more than mere instruction, and that this principle can be safeguarded only where education is built upon a foundation of religion. For the former reason it is difficult for those to obtain a fair hearing who believe that religious education cannot be permanently effective unless there is a background of definite doctrine and the discipline of a corporate life. If the principles adopted in the former part of this essay are of any validity, it will follow from them that only under the auspices of the Church, coextensive with the nation, and fulfilling her responsibilities in a genuinely Catholic spirit, could a perfect system of national education be attained. As the Church is not coextensive with the nation, and as the growing sense of

solidarity, itself in no small measure due to the principles of Christianity, has brought it into universal recognition that the education of the people is the duty, as well as the interest, of the nation as a whole, the State has to undertake the work at an initial disadvantage. It has to assume a function which cannot, in the opinion of most of its members, be altogether dissociated from religion, while it may not and cannot adopt a definite religious attitude. It has to hold the balance even between competing religious bodies and that not inconsiderable minority of citizens who would altogether exclude religion from education, and confine it to secular instruction with perhaps the addition of moral precepts divorced from any religious sanction or supernatural aid to their observance.

2. But the Church is also at a disadvantage in doing her proper work for her own children. As things stand, she is not allowed that measure of freedom which is due to her on grounds of gratitude and of justice.

Of gratitude ; for it is often forgotten how enormous is the debt which the nation owes in this matter to the national Church. That the nation has, during the century now closing, been awakened to the duty of securing that an education is open to all its poorer members, and is, at its close, awakening to the need of organising and supplying gaps in the provision of secondary education, is no small matter for thankfulness ; and Churchmen are the last persons to regret these things or grudge the fullest opportunities for their development. But Churchmen may also rightly point to the fact that long before the duty was felt as national it was being performed, if not exclusively, yet predominantly by the Church. Not less truly since the Reformation than before it has the Church been the mother of English education. In almost all the higher schools of the country, the great public schools, and the smaller grammar

schools, founded or re-founded at any time from the middle of the sixteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth, the endowments have been given or the school has been established by Churchmen for the children of the Church. In the great majority of cases provision has been made that the headmasters should be in holy orders, and that instruction should be given in the religion of the Church as an integral part of the work of the school. And what is true of secondary is almost equally true of elementary education. Up to the time of the first intervention of the State in this work in 1833, every penny spent upon it was spent by members of religious bodies for religious purposes, and of these, while the excellent work of the British and Foreign Society deserves full and grateful recognition, it is not to be denied that the Church was in the van of the educational movement. The self-sacrificing perseverance of the clergy and laity of the Church, which found its expression in the work of the National Society, against much discouragement and prejudice, when it was hard to get people to believe that the poor ought to be educated at all, laid the foundation on which it was possible to build a system of national education. Educationalists of the present day are rightly enthusiastic; they are liberal, at times even reckless, in the expenditure of public money for excellent ends. But it is an offence against historical truth if any section of them suppose that religious people are, in proportion as they desire to base education upon religion, educational obscurantists. It is an offence against gratitude if, when the nation has rightly undertaken the work for which Churchmen long before had drained their own pockets, and in which Churchmen not less than others are ready to take their due share, the result should be (and who can say that there is no danger of it?) that the Church should find her proper work of educating her own children

rendered impossible by the pressure of a nation's wealth and by what appears, at least to them, an inequitable distribution of it.

For, apart from gratitude, Churchmen do complain, and the complaint cannot be too often repeated, that the present system of national education is not consistent with justice towards their deepest convictions. It is not that they grudge anything that is done for the perfection of secular instruction. They desire to see every possible opportunity given, and are ready to take their full share in giving it, to children of all classes. They recognise that the legislation of 1870 has been productive, on the secular side, of untold blessings. But they cannot be satisfied with the secular side of education, and they hold that their religious work has been unfairly dealt with, and not theirs only, but that of any other religious body which holds that religion and morals can only be taught upon a definite dogmatic basis. A great opportunity was offered in 1870 of providing a system of national education for which all could be equally enthusiastic, and the opportunity was lost. It was lost by a most unfortunate application of the English spirit of compromise.* It would have been possible to establish with public money schools from which all religious instruction should be excluded, and to refuse public money to all schools in which any religion was taught. This was actually suggested at the time. It would have had the merit of extreme logical simplicity. It would have proclaimed that the State as such had nothing to do with religion. It would have been strictly impartial in its injustice towards all religious bodies. It would have sounded the death-knell of religious education in every shape or form, and it would therefore never have been tolerated by the religious temper of the English people.

* This subject is clearly treated in GENT'S *Papers and Essays*, p. 103.

Another logical alternative would have been to give, as before, equal aid to all existing schools of whatever denomination on condition of their secular efficiency, and to give the fullest opportunity to denominations for supplying schools where others were needed, in the security that State aid would be given impartially to all. The compromise actually adopted was illogical and unfair. The establishment of board schools which were to have the advantage, denied to voluntary schools, of compulsory rate aid, the permission in those schools of religious instruction and the exclusion from them of every denominational religious formulary, was an arrangement designed to meet the views of all parties, but one which has in fact caused all the irritation of the last thirty years. It is not impartial, and it is not just. The most perplexing feature of the period has been the inability of good religious people to understand why so many other religious people cannot be satisfied with it. Yet that they are not so, the continued existence of voluntary schools is the witness. Had the compromise been really satisfactory, all Anglican, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, and Jewish schools might have been closed within a year.

3. Why, then, is it felt to be unjust? It is impossible to bring a new argument to bear on the subject, but the old arguments must be stated again and again until they have sunk into the conscience of the nation.

In the first place the supporters of voluntary schools regard undenominational religion as the thing that is not. There is not, in fact, any residuum of religious truth left by the straining away of the distinctive tenets of every religious communion. There is nothing on which every religious citizen, once secure that his children will learn so much at least, can build up the special fabric of his own Church or sect. We may set aside the pure secularist. He can withdraw his child from religious instruction

altogether and be happy. Religious people wish their children to be taught religion at school. But, when you are dealing with all citizens, how is it just to teach even doctrines, such as the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Divinity of Christ, on which the majority of religious people are agreed? To teach these must at least be unjust to Unitarians and to Jews. Nothing can in fact be taught which will satisfy all religious people except the barest truths of natural religion. Complaints have been made of the teaching of Unitarianism in board schools. If the fact is true, the complaint is just. Such teaching violates the undenominational principle. But it is equally violated by the teaching of the doctrine of the Trinity. London board school teachers have resented an inquiry into their religious beliefs; on undenominational principles quite rightly. For what is this undenominational creed which all are to accept? Undenominationalism, as soon as it is fairly examined, stands convicted of logical absurdity.

In the second place, we have to deal with an answer to the argument just offered. "We are dealing," it may be said, "not with logic but with fact. We may set aside the case of Unitarians and of Jews. *De minimis non curat lex*. The vast majority of people in this country accept the foundation evangelical truths you mentioned just now, and surely they can be satisfied with the teaching of the Bible, which all accept in some sense at least as the Word of God, without asking for the superstructure of Church doctrines." The claim that in Bible reading all may come together is very plausible and very misleading. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" "How can I, except some man should guide me?" To give a few illustrations only, how is it possible to read the parables of the kingdom, our Lord's commission to His apostles, the conversation with Nicodemus, the discourse at Caper-

naum, without either teaching or denying, or so markedly leaving out as implicitly to deny, the existence of a visible Church, apostolical succession, the Church's doctrine of Baptism and Holy Communion? Here, again, undenominational religion is impossible.

In the third place, it must be said that the attempt to pursue an impossible ideal results in the injustice that so-called undenominationalism is in practice the establishment in power of some religious bodies against others. In other words, if there is no such thing as an undenominational residuum, then that teaching which professes to be such must be in fact denominational. This is a point to which attention has been drawn in recent years, but which, perhaps, has not been sufficiently pressed home by the injured parties in the controversy as a whole. Yet it was made plain to those who would see by the immediate result of the Act of 1870. The Act provided that a board school must be established in every place where the supply of school places was inadequate. In a great number of places, where the supply of places was adequate, the existing British and Foreign schools were closed in the course of a few years; the supply was rendered inadequate, and the board school was established. The reason is obvious. Had the board school religious teaching not satisfied the Protestant Dissenters, they would have maintained their own schools. If, on the contrary, they expected the so-called undenominational teaching to be of the same kind with that which they had previously given, it was only natural that they should be anxious to be rid of the responsibility and anxiety of maintaining schools by their voluntary subscriptions, and to call to the aid of the religious teaching which satisfied them the enforced payments of Churchmen whom it could not satisfy. They saw plainly enough that—the vast majority of the nation professing in some form the Christian religion,

and the majority of teachers being Christians — they could on the whole rely on instruction being given which would give a knowledge of the contents of the Bible, and not, at least flagrantly, deny the Divinity of our Lord, but from which would be excluded all teaching as to a visible Church and the Sacraments. This was exactly what had previously been given in their own schools; it was exactly what they wanted. They are not in the least to be blamed for their action in closing their schools; it was most natural that they should do so. But it is, to say the least, greatly to be regretted that the opportunity should have been given, and that under the specious pretence of undenominationalism, the religious teaching of certain Protestant sects should have been thus endowed with public money at the expense of the rest of the nation, and to the grievous injury of other denominations.

There is a good side to everything. Undoubtedly, the profusion of public expenditure has levelled up the efficiency of voluntary as well as of board schools. The immense, and in a great measure successful, sacrifices of Churchmen and of Roman Catholics have enabled the voluntary schools to hold their own in a manner far beyond what might have been expected. Voluntary schools not less than board schools have increased in number as population has increased. The accommodation in Church of England schools alone has been doubled since 1870, in spite of losses caused by the surrender of many. But the struggle has been, and is, severe. It has been attended by much loss. If many new voluntary schools have been established, the list of those abandoned is unhappily a long one. Its severity has not been diminished by the gift of free education, for increased grants of money to meet it have gone *pari passu* with increased demands. It cannot be good for the temper of the nation that the tenacity with which the supporters

of voluntary schools have contended for them has been accompanied with a rankling sense of injustice arising from the fact that, in the majority of cases, they have been compelled to pay at the same time for a system which they detest. But that tenacity shows that the praise which is lavished at times (no doubt within certain limits deservedly) on the excellent religious teaching given in board schools, and the good-natured tolerance which asserts that there need be no religious question in elementary education, alike miss their mark, and that Churchmen cannot and will not accept the legislation of 1870 as the final solution of the problem.

To understand why they cannot accept it, it is only necessary to open the Prayer-book at the Catechism. The Church requires that the Catechism should be taught; and the Catechism appeals to every child who learns it by resting the whole of religion and morality not simply upon the relation of the individual soul to God, but upon his position as a baptised member of a corporate Body. His rejection of sin is the result of his incorporation into the Body of Christ; his faith is the creed of his Baptism; his morality is his duty towards God and his neighbour, promised at his Baptism, and made possible for him by the grace which was given to him at Baptism, and is to be renewed continually in Holy Communion. It is simply an impossibility that any Churchman who has grasped this fundamental truth can be content with a system of education which not only fails to begin with it, but actually excludes it. For, in spite of initial protests to the contrary, any reference to it is contrary to the spirit, and most undoubtedly any effective teaching of it would violate the letter, of the Cowper-Temple clause.

4. The injustice which has been dealt with actually exists only in the case of elementary education, because it is only here that grants of public money have as yet been

given on a large scale. But in approaching the problem of secondary education and its organisation, Churchmen must be guided by the same principles. It is sometimes said that we must be very careful not to raise the religious question in this matter, and that to do so will provoke a strife which may indefinitely delay the much-desired settlement. If this means that Churchmen must not make exorbitant demands, and must not expose themselves to the accusation of wishing to exploit the organisation of education for their own religious ends, the warning is most wise. But it may be doubted whether it is necessary. Churchmen have no such desire, and, if they had it, they would know that it could not be accomplished. But all far-seeing educationalists must be on their guard against the extension to secondary of the injustice which has hampered elementary education. An unfortunate example has already been given in the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, and an extension to English secondary schools of compulsory undenominationalism would bring with it evils that would go far to outweigh all the benefits to be expected from forthcoming legislation. The principle must be secured, and, if attacked, defended, that religious bodies must be free to educate their own children in their own faith. It is not necessary or desirable to invite legislation on the religious question. It is only necessary to guard against legislation which is unjust. Provided that freedom be secured, it is probable that secondary schools will settle whatever religious difficulty may arise in their own way, and a way which will commend itself to lovers of education and lovers of liberty.

III.

In the first division of this essay the attempt has been made to show what are the principles on which sound education should be based, and what would appear to be the special function of the Anglican Church and the spirit of Anglicanism in giving them effect. In the second division it has been considered what are the difficulties in England itself, difficulties mainly religious, and arising from the history of lost opportunities, in realising the ideal. It remains to be stated how the principles that have been defended may be best applied to existing facts, and what are the requirements which Anglicans should claim to make, in the interest alike of education and of religion, in future developments of national education. The present period is not less critical than that of thirty years ago. The establishment of the Board of Education, which is to control elementary education and under which we are at last to see the organisation of secondary schools, offers great opportunities, and of necessity some risks. This is not the place to explain its provisions or to discuss in detail the numerous educational questions which will arise from its operation. But some estimate may usefully be attempted of the temper in which Anglican Churchmen should make use of the new opportunities, and the demands for which they claim the recognition of the nation.

It must be made clear, to begin with, that Churchmen, as such, make no unreasonable or exclusive demands. They do not ask to control national education. They do not invoke the shade of the founder to take vengeance upon the spoiler, or claim to keep for their own exclusive use endowments given for the benefit of Churchmen, without regard to the question whether they are doing useful work or blocking, by the inefficiency or want of method with which they are employed, the best interests of the

nation. They recognise, not grudgingly, but gladly, that the State is doing its proper duty when it is at last taking steps to unite in one comprehensive system the whole educational machinery of the country. To carry this out will be a work of considerable time, and will involve many difficulties. It is the duty of all citizens to co-operate so as to lead it along the line of least resistance; and as Churchmen have been among the first to press for the required legislation, so they will be the last to introduce friction into its course by an unreasonable insistence upon any privileges of their own.

Anglicans, then, accept the principle that it is the duty of the State, in respect of all secular instruction, to provide both its equipment and its maintenance from public money wherever the need exists and there is no other source for its provision; where there are other sources, as from fees or endowments, to assist it so far as may be necessary; and to organise, co-ordinate, control, and inspect it all. But they do claim that schools, already existing or hereafter to be provided by voluntary effort, in which the Churchman's ideal is realised and education based upon the Catholic religion, shall not be at any disadvantage compared with others; and they do claim that in other schools their own children should have the opportunity of the religious teaching in which their parents believe, and should not be forced into a system of teaching which cannot satisfy them at the cost of exclusion from religious teaching of any kind. One way lies freedom; on the other side looms the shadow of intolerance.

And while they ask this freedom for themselves, they ask it also for others. They are interested, no doubt, in securing the Church's teaching for their own children, but they are not less interested in the cause of liberty. They demand nothing for themselves which they do not also demand, not as a concession but as a right, for all others.

If the Anglican Catholic pleads for opportunities to be given no less to the Roman Catholic, the Protestant Dissenter, or the Jew, than to himself, it is not because he thinks this the only condition of securing his own claims, but because he believes in the principle of liberty, wishes to apply the principle of toleration without fear or favour, and holds that where all are free alike the truth (whether it be found most perfectly in his own conception of it or in others) will at last prevail; and it is in the interest of equal freedom for all that he protests, and will protest, against compulsory undenominationalism.

Such an attitude is in accordance with the true genius of Anglicanism. It is the attitude which is certainly taken by the great majority of Churchmen who are interested in approaching changes with regard to secondary schools. It would be too much to claim that it has always been adopted by all who have been concerned with elementary education. Anglican clergy have, it is to be feared, a reputation for narrowness of view, which has not been in all cases undeserved. The parson of a parish has indeed a responsibility to God for all the dwellers in it; he is bound to banish false doctrine. But he must do so by persuasion, preaching, and a holy life; not by the methods of the Inquisition. Dissenters, not less than Churchmen, have a right to be heard, and a right to claim for their own children the teaching of their own religion. If Church teaching should be given in board schools, not less justly should the doctrines of Dissent be taught in Church schools to those who desire it when no other opportunity is available. Where the authorities of a Church school resist this claim they are insisting on privilege against a true freedom, and are showing a spirit inconsistent with the real principles of their Church. The claims of Churchmen can rightly be based only upon the

principles of equal justice, and upon a sincere attempt to understand and try to meet the views and the difficulties of those who differ from them.

Whether primary and secondary education should be controlled by the same personnel under the new Education Board, and where or how the line is to be drawn between primary, technical and secondary education, are questions which concern the educationalist rather than the Churchman as such, and space alone would make their discussion impossible here. But there are four aims to be noted which the Church, as the mother of liberty, and as interested in the welfare of the nation as a whole, will have in view.

1. Any perfect system of national education will provide the ladder by which really capable boys or girls of the poorer classes will be able to rise to the highest education which can be provided in the country. This was the case, within limits imposed by the circumstances of the time, before the Reformation; it should be possible now without any limit except that imposed by the talent and industry of the scholar. And, in accordance with the principles already expounded, the advantages of any scheme of exhibitions by which this is made possible should be open freely and equally to all schools, secular or religious, of any denomination or of none.

2. The abolition of fees in elementary education is final. The nation will not go back on that. But it ought not to be extended (except in the cases of special merit just mentioned) in the region of secondary education. Free education was the logical result of compulsion. But it is one thing for the State to impose a minimum of education upon all its citizens and to pay for it; it is quite another to supply, entirely out of public money, education of a higher kind for those who can, with

advantage to themselves, attend a higher school. To do this is to pauperise the community; and the Church cannot favour it because it tends to weaken the principle, too much weakened already, of parental responsibility. While men in great towns are known to drive in their carriages to their houses of business, and drop their boys at the higher grade board school, when a first-rate secondary school is within their reach, we are not inclined to give them without payment the education for their children for which they can pay and will not.

3. Whatever be the delimitation of primary and secondary schools, and whatever the exact nature of the authority by which each is controlled, the interests of the nation demand that the liberty and variety, which is the boast of English secondary education, should not be contracted. Primary education may and probably does demand the cast-iron rule of a somewhat despotic department of State. But as we rise higher in the scale of development, in schools where teachers are more highly educated, and subjects of teaching more numerous and carried to a higher point, such a rule would repress much that is most valuable, and most characteristic of the British spirit. The greater public schools are ready to fall into line with the organisation of education. No body of men has pressed for it more earnestly than the Headmasters' Conference. But they are not prepared to sacrifice their own distinctive traditions, their special *esprit de corps*, the opportunities which they give to the best masters for development of all that is best in the special work they have in hand. Organisation means, without this, a great deal that is most necessary. It means that the waste of endowment on inefficient schools must be stopped; that suitable schools must be placed within reach of all parts of the population; that where schools overlap, the locality or the curricula of some must

be altered ; that teachers must be trained to their work for secondary as well as for primary schools ; that those private schools which are inefficient must no longer be able to lull the parents of their boys into a false security which has a rude awakening ; that all schools must be open to inspection, given or recognised by State authority, in respect of the value of their teaching, the use made of their endowments, their sanitary equipment, their adaptability to the needs of their neighbourhood. On all these points much might be written, and organisation includes them all. It does not require that the Minister of Education should be able to point to a time table in London and boast that at a given hour all English boys or girls in secondary schools are learning the same lesson.

4. The constitution of, and the powers to be entrusted to, local authorities are the most debated and the most important of the points which are, at the time of writing, still unsettled. The main principle, however, which the educational reformer should set before him in their discussion is that the areas of local authorities should be wide enough to free them from the influence of local jealousies or of class interest. Education is a more important matter, and requires a wider outlook, than questions of drainage and lighting ; and no one who has a voice in the general arrangements for the education of a locality ought to be tempted to consider their effect upon his own pocket. Again, the local authorities must include representatives of a wide range of interests, and among them must be educational experts. But these will not be found willing to serve on bodies in which they have to contend against the narrow prejudices of parochialism. Moreover, it will probably be thought desirable that a considerable amount of power should be placed in the hands of local authorities, and that the function of the

central authority, for most if not all schools, should rather be to sanction and stimulate local action than to act independently of it. But it is certain that, the wider the area, the greater are the powers which may be safely entrusted to the local body. The area suggested by the Royal Commission on Education is that of the county or county borough. If it should prove possible to extend it beyond this, and, in accordance with a suggestion which has recently received influential support, to entrust the work to bodies representative of large districts, embracing in most cases several counties, and each containing a University or University College, it might be found possible to give to these bodies almost all effective power within their districts; and certainly the larger "non-local" schools would be far more willing to place themselves, under a body like this, in line with other schools, so that a great advance would be made towards the unity of educational organisation.

IV.

Some further points of educational policy, affecting respectively primary and secondary schools, may be treated in conclusion.

1. The new local authorities are called into existence to meet the need of the organisation of secondary schools. But the new central authority takes the place of the Education Department, and is to survey the whole educational field. The scheme will be logically complete, although the change is not an absolute necessity, if the local authorities also take primary education within their sphere of operation. It is hard to see why the central board should control one branch through parochial boards, and the other through county boards or bodies repre-

sentative of wider areas still. Provided that the new local areas be wide enough to allow justice to be done to secondary education, there seems no reason why elementary education should not be placed under the same bodies. This would bring a double benefit to the latter. Parochial school boards would remain as local managers of the State schools, but they would have no more power to levy rates. The ultimate financial control would pass from their hands. Public money would be more equitably administered if the education rate were no longer a parochial, but at the least a county rate, and were devoted, in proper proportions, to the assistance of both branches of national education. The whole question of rating is at the present time in a condition of suspense, and, if important changes are made, it will be well worthy of the consideration of the Government whether the burden of education should not be altogether removed from the rates and thrown on the imperial exchequer, which already bears a large part of it. Public assistance would then be given impartially to all schools without invidious comparisons pointed by local jealousies, and the present sense of injustice would be removed from those who are forced at once by the rate-collector to maintain the board school, and by their convictions to support the voluntary school.

The second benefit would be that a final and equitable settlement of the religious difficulty would be far more easy. Religious irritation is bred in small areas; a just and impartial arrangement would be better administered by a widely representative body. The controversies and experience of recent years seem to show on what lines such a settlement should be made, and impending changes may give the opportunity for it. The first necessity is the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause. Churchmen must not rest until this is done. The State should then give

equal assistance to all elementary schools of every kind, supplying the whole cost, whether from rates or taxes, of the secular instruction. It is enough that denominationalism has for thirty years paid doubly, and to that extent relieved the State of its proper duty. In the present board schools, or in any others built by the State, it would then be necessary that the State should allow denominational instruction to be given (whether in its own building or during school hours in another) to the children of any parents who claimed it. It would be a reasonable demand that its cost should be defrayed by the denomination, and readiness to do this, with ability to keep the parents up to making the claim, would be a fair test of the earnestness and the deserts of the religious body in question. But it would, in this case, not be just that any so-called undenominational teaching should be given from public money, because this, as has been shown, is the endowment of some religious bodies to the detriment of others.

Yet even this settlement, equitable though it would be, and the best that can be devised for State schools in a divided people, would not justify Churchmen in abandoning their own. For the Church's ideal of education requires that not merely the teacher of religious knowledge, but the educator who trains the children's characters and guides their minds to understand all the subjects they learn should be himself a Churchman. And this can only be secured in a school which belongs to the Church. The same may be said of any other voluntary school; and the religious denomination ought to be able, and would be able, to undertake the building and repair of its own schools, if it were relieved from the present cruel competition of schools not only built, but in all respects maintained out of the rates.

If these privileges be secured Churchmen must of course

be prepared to give in their own schools the same facilities for religious instruction to the children of Dissenters who have no other school open to them, which they claim for themselves in a similar situation. But the bugbear of popular control, which deters some Churchmen from pressing for further assistance from public money, would disappear altogether if that assistance came from the imperial exchequer, or even from the rates of a wide area and not merely from the parish. All schools alike would be under the local authority, which would be responsible for secular efficiency alone; all schools alike would have their own local managers, and the appointment of the teachers (the one really essential point) would be in their hands.

2. In the field of secondary education the religious question has not provoked the same fierce controversy as in that of primary. Whether it does so in the future or not will depend mainly on the wisdom of statesmen. If they leave the question open, avoiding the pitfalls into which their predecessors have fallen, education need not be hampered by it, and religious liberty will be furthered to the benefit both of religion and education. The comparative peace of the past has been due to several causes. Public money has not, at least until quite recently, been given to it, and money from the rates not at all. The governors of schools are not, as a body, elected by the ratepayers. They are as a rule drawn from a more educated and liberal society than many members of parochial school boards. And further it is to be feared that in many local schools, which draw their pupils entirely or for the most part from the immediate neighbourhood, headmasters have been inclined to cry peace where there was no real peace, and in fear of raising local difficulties have shrunk from offering definite religious teaching to the children of those parents who desire it, or ought

to desire it. The undenominational idea has here, too, worked havoc. The efforts of Churchmen must be directed first to secure that it may not be forced upon new or existing schools by legislative compulsion; secondly, to obtain a breathing space, where new secondary schools are required, in which voluntary schools may, if possible, be provided; and thirdly, by diocesan organisations to stimulate Church people throughout the country to demanding for their own children instruction in the Creed, the Catechism, and the history of their Church. Exactly as in primary schools, so here, the only thing needful is perfect liberty and impartial State assistance where such is given; and it is heartily to be desired that members of other denominations should make corresponding demands. The conscience clause is not enough. In every local school the religion of the parents must be taught to the children. If this principle can once be accepted, local difficulties will disappear, while the inconveniences or possible disadvantages of dividing the school into sections would prove much less than is sometimes feared. In any case, this difficulty is far outweighed by the danger, so destructive of all authority and of all strong religious principle, of allowing boys and girls to grow up in ignorance of the doctrine and discipline of the Church into which they were baptised, or of the religious body, whatever it be, to which their parents belong.

The case of the non-local or boarding-schools is somewhat different. No parent is compelled by circumstances to send his child to any particular boarding-school. Its religious complexion may and should enter into his consideration when he is choosing his school. When he has chosen it, he entrusts his child to its authorities entirely for three-quarters of the year for secular teaching, for moral training, for religious instruction, for public worship.

The responsibility of the school to him is all the greater. How far it is possible to go, even in a boarding-school, in making special provision for members of other denominations must be within the discretion of the school authorities and determined by circumstances. At one or two great public schools it is found that something can be done. But the school must have some definite religious character. The chapel worship and teaching must be the worship and teaching of the Church or else of some other denomination. In fact, most of the great schools are, as the result of their history, in the hands of Churchmen, and their worship is that of the Church. In the unlikely event of any attempt being made to deprive them of this character by legislation, it would be the duty of all Churchmen to unite in opposition to such a measure. It is their more practical and immediate duty to give to the authorities of the schools in which their children are such sympathy and encouragement, even if need be to apply to them such pressure, as to secure that the religious training of their children, which is yearly improving in value and efficiency, should be maintained at the highest point. Thus only can they pass into the temptations and the controversies of a larger world, intelligent believers in the doctrine, and practical adherents of the discipline, of the Church which claims them for her own.

In conclusion, the purpose of this essay will have been secured if it has been shown that education, viewed in the spirit of Anglican Christianity, is a very solemn responsibility and a very noble work; that the Church in England, while she desires liberty to do her proper work for her own baptised members, is not merely willing to concede, but demands on principle an equal liberty for all other religious organisations; that Anglicans not merely welcome, but wish to take their fullest share in furthering the work of national education, because they believe that

all patient study, all earnest teaching, all careful training of character will bring more light and more strength to the English people, will tend to the glory of God, and will advance the manifestation of the Truth as it is in Christ. It is their principle that where there is liberty there is truth, and "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

XI.

The Bible and Modern Criticism

By T. B. STRONG, B.D.

THE Bible is the sacred book of the Christian Church. In it are to be found the limits of true doctrine, the principles of worship, the ideal forms of spiritual emotion, and the laws of moral life. As the Church of Christ covers the whole of human life, so the Bible affords the principles upon which man's various interests and powers must be guided. It is the source of all Christian thought, and is as wide as Christian life. It must be remembered, however, that this authoritative position did not always belong to it. In the earliest days of the Church many of the books of the New Testament were not in existence. Of those that now form part of the Canon, some did not find their way there, at any rate universally, for some considerable time; and there are some books which seem to have had, as we may say, a good chance of a place in the sacred list, but were finally rejected by the Church. Thus the New Testament Canon was a growth—a list of books deliberately selected out of a larger number as representative of the spirit and doctrine of the Society to which they belonged, and as containing the teaching of the earliest followers of Christ. The New Testament was thus the product of the Church, and

not the Church of the New Testament. Or rather, the growth of the Church as a living Society, and the gradual disappearance of its original leading members, forced into prominence the writings, almost always occasional writings, which they had put out in their lifetime. These contained the doctrine of those whose living voice had passed into silence. For a few years there still echoed some few fragments of their teaching which had not been written in their books; but these sounds soon cease, and we are left with the collection of books as we now have it, containing all that is generally necessary for salvation.

It is probable that the formation of the Old Testament Canon was a work of considerable time, and it may be that the three divisions which still obtain in our Hebrew Bibles mark three separate collections of books; but we are not immediately concerned with this question. The Old Testament was taken over by the Christian Church practically as it now stands. Some have thought that the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes were added later than the time of Christ, but there is no sign in any Christian writer of any knowledge that additions had been recently made. So far as positive evidence goes, it is safe to say that the Old Testament was received by the Church from the Jews as a whole, but it was received with a special intention and in a special sense. To the apostles the phrase "The Scripture" meant always the Old Testament. In this book they found a recital of the long preparation of the world for the coming of Christ, indications of the methods of God's providence, and foreshadowings of the new dispensation which Christ had brought about. Thus the value of the Old Testament to the apostles first, and through them to the Church, lay in its distinctively Christian bearing. As a record of law, and history, and prophecy, it was fulfilled by the new

order of things. It had never been a dead record of past facts and dead men; it was alive through and through with future hope, so that at any point where it might be touched its main message would sound forth; even its details had significance, and bore on the future Messiah. It was taken over from the Jews, but not in a Jewish sense. To the mind of the apostles it was now for the first time interpreted adequately, seeing that the full and unclouded light necessary for understanding it came from the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus the Old Testament, received from the Old Dispensation, and interpreted by the New, combined with the books selected gradually out of a larger list by the instinct of the Church under the Holy Spirit's guidance, forms the sacred book of the Christian Society. The disappearance of much of the literature of the early Church, and the consequent vanishing of almost all fragments of oral tradition outside the Scriptures, leave this Book or Collection of Books standing alone and authoritative. This position has been given them, in some form and in some sense, from the time when the Canon was fixed until the present day. The Bible has never been wholly ignored. The great heresies of the fourth century were defended as being a true interpretation of Holy Scripture. The Roman Church in the sixteenth century would have condemned itself if it had condemned Holy Scripture. It did attempt to forbid all interpretations of Scripture except its own, and disallowed the free use and interpretation of it by unlearned and unauthorised persons. But its defenders appeal to Scripture like anybody else, as may be seen in their works; only they appeal to it as glossed and explained by generations of accredited teachers. In some form or other Scripture has never fallen from its position as the final court of appeal, but it has been treated at every

age in accordance with the principles and ideas prevalent at the time.

It is of importance to dwell for a time upon the methods prevalent in earlier ages, in order to see more clearly the exact point raised by the Church's use of Holy Scripture and the relation of this to modern criticism. The apostles, as we have seen, accepted the Old Testament with a particular interpretation upon it. In so doing they invented no new idea of the Old Testament. The Jews, their enemies, agreed with them in thinking that such a fulfilment of their Scriptures as the apostles proclaimed was to be expected, but they denied that it had come in Jesus. Thus the apostles were not called upon to consider the *proof* of the Christian method of dealing with the Old Testament, or of their assumptions in regard to it. They had rather to express in a convincing form their own application of principles already widely prevalent. But it must always be remembered that this was argumentation by which they endeavoured to justify to their contemporaries what they had already verified in experience themselves. They were witnesses to a new life, of which they knew the effects in their own personal experience, and saw similar results in the lives of others. The inferences from the Old Testament, considered as a prophetic book, are only part of the whole evidence for their faith. Further, the Old Testament is not merely a repertory of phrases and ideas and apt quotations, illustrative of a new religion; it is to the apostles a record of definite acts on the part of God which have a real place in history. The new dispensation comes, not merely as supplying an answer to enigmatic predictions of old, but as a new and more striking instance of God's self-manifestation. The old dispensation was established by a series of definite acts on God's part. The Jewish people lived under the special

guidance of God; through all their unfaithfulness and self-will He never forsook them, so that they stood towards God in a relation different from that of all the other nations of the earth. By definite acts at definite historic moments He had separated the Jews from the other nations, and given them actual privileges of service. The new outpouring of the Spirit was in organic continuity with these previous manifestations; historic, as they were historic; conveyed in historic events, and not merely by the suggestion of ideas; but final in the sense in which the previous dispensation had been merely preparatory and incomplete. The old order had looked forward to a new order to come; the new order is final for this world: it has the keys of death and of Hades.

It would not be difficult to illustrate this method at considerable length; but to do so would be out of proportion to the subject in hand. We will therefore refer to one instance only: the use in the New Testament of the idea of Israel. This word is, of course, in the Old Testament the covenant name of Jacob, and, as applied to the people, it is symbolic of their covenant relation with Jehovah. By rejecting Christ the people, to use Dr. Hort's words, "had in effect apostatised from Israel": the covenant-name had ceased to belong to them. Language which had once been used of them had ceased to be true of them, owing to the change in the historic conditions, and was now applicable to the Christian Church only. Perhaps the extreme instance of this method is to be found in Rom. x. 6-8, where language, once used (Deut. xxx. 12-14) of the Jewish religion in contrast with paganism, is applied to the contrast between the righteousness of faith and the old dispensation. But the recognition of this method is, to quote Dr. Hort again, "the true key to most of the use of the Old Testament

in the New Testament generally"*; and the reason for it is to be found in the apostolic conception of revelation. It is not a promulgation of religious ideas, but a series of historic acts, out of which, by reflection, the true notions of God and man could be derived. The phrase at the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses with complete precision this attitude; "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath in the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son."

We have now considered shortly the attitude towards the written Word which prevailed in apostolic times. We see that the Bible and the life of the Christian Church were, so to speak, mutually illustrative. The written Revelation connected the vigorous and unmistakable activity of the Christian Society with the past action of God in regard to the chosen people, and also supplied prophetic indication of the lines upon which God's purpose might be expected to move. The addition to the sacred Canon of the New Testament books involved some change. These determined the sense in which the Old Testament was received, and themselves required interpretation as time went on. The closing of the Canon means that these books are regarded as conveying exhaustively the knowledge and guidance requisite to assist the Church on its way. But, of course, as circumstances change, the principles contained in the Bible require to be set forth anew; the relation between it and the course of the Church's life has to be demonstrated and made articulate. The letter of the Bible is fixed, but the spirit of the age is constantly changing. Circumstances arise which the apostles could never have foreseen, and in some way the Bible, conceived as a vehicle of revelation to which no additions are to be made, is to be interpreted

* HORT's *Ep. of St. Peter*, p. 7.

so as to meet the new situation. This was the problem which lay before the Church, and there can be no question that it was one of extreme difficulty; but it was not altogether a new problem. Various philosophers of eminence had put forward theories of the universe and of knowledge, and had, as the phrase is, founded schools. They were followed by men of intelligence rather than originality: men who endeavoured to propagate their master's system by putting it in a persuasive form. These found exegesis of some sort a necessity. They endeavoured to extract, for instance, from the Homeric poems, treated allegorically, evidence and authority for the philosophy of their choice. Homer was supposed to have put forward the philosophy of Pythagoras, under the form of epic poetry; and already Philo had pointed the way to a similar treatment of the Old Testament. By the further use of allegory he had endeavoured to prove the coincidence between the political and religious ordinances of Moses, and the eclectic Greek philosophy which he held to be sound. Plato himself had been, according to Philo, influenced indirectly by Moses; it was not surprising, therefore, that the writings of the two authors should bear marks of this connection. There was, therefore, a method ready to hand when the Christian teachers set to work to explain their position to the world; and it is not surprising that it became highly popular and, in fact, almost universal. Origen, when challenged by Celsus upon this point, definitely alleges the parallel practice of philosophers in his defence (*c. Cels.* I. xvii., II. 7), and cites St. Paul's interpretation of the story of Hagar as a further apostolic justification (*c. Cels.* IV. xlv.). In like manner Augustine (*c. Faust.* XII. xxxvii.-xxxix.) refers to the practice of Philo and of Pagan philosophers to illustrate his own method. And even Chrysostom, who represents the opposite school of interpretation, is fain to

admit the occasional use of allegory (Exp. in Psalm xlv. c. i., tom. v. p. 188 c.), though he contends for the principle of literalism as a rule.

Much has been said and may be said again for and against this method of dealing with the Scriptures. Our concern with it here is not to arraign or defend it, but to indicate how it was used for the exposition of the current view of the Holy Scriptures. It was a method already used by commentators upon secular works, and it was chosen as an obvious and recognised method of solving real difficulties. Thus, in answer to the Manichæan assaults upon the Old Testament, St. Augustine urges the use of allegory as a means of setting out the real unity of Scripture and its teaching. Certain things, like sacrifice, were ordained in view of the undeveloped moral position of ancient peoples (*c. Faust.* XVIII. vi., “Magis ea perverso populo congruenter imposita, quam Deo desideranti oblata”), and yet the use of allegory enables us to see, even in these things, anticipations of that which was to come (*c. Faust.* XXXII. viii.).* All things in the Old Testament refer ultimately to Christ, “de Ipso dicta vel propter Ipsum.” This alone will explain the inclusion in the sacred story of apparently unimportant, sometimes of unedifying, details. Scripture was to the Fathers a single whole, conveying a Revelation which was essentially one. This had not been promulgated once and for all, but had appeared in stages, so that the consentience of the parts was evidence of the unity of the whole. Further, the Book was not independent of the Society which accepted and authorised it. The tradition of the Church, the analogy of the Faith, helped to restrain the dangerous freedom of the allegorical method, and to distinguish the true canonical books from those put forward, for instance, by the

* Cf. Orig. *c. Cels.* IV. lxxvii.: ἔοικεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος ᾠκονομηκεῖν τὰ ἀναγεγραμμένα, μετρήσαι τῇ δυνάμει τῶν ἀκούοντων. Rules of Tychonius. Rules I. and II.

Manichæan sects.* And the same principles were of importance in regard to a still greater danger of the allegorical method, viz., its total independence of history. To Philo it would hardly seem of any interest, whether the events described in the Pentateuch occurred historically or not; he is contented if he can base a philosophical exhortation upon them. The Alexandrine school came perilously near this view of things; even Origen uses language of some of our Lord's actions which has a Docetic savour, under the pressure of some difficulty in the literal account. But he stoutly affirms a grave and decisive difference between the scriptural histories and those of Pagan deities; both may be capable of allegorical interpretation, he admits, but there is no basis of fact underlying the Pagan myths.†

Origen and Augustine are typical exponents of the method of their age. It would be easy to find in their works instances of forced and absurd interpretations, and they have sometimes been judged on grounds of that sort. But it is unjust to judge them and their age by the errors into which their method easily led them; the historic importance of their work lies in the fact that they preserved and defended, as best they could, a particular view of Holy Scripture; namely, that it contained the true account of God's dealing with man, and that it centred in the Incarnation; that this was the inner unity which held all the books together, and that there was a true and a false way of understanding it, of which the determination was in the hands of the Body intrusted with the testimony of Jesus. It is clear that in course of time interpretation would tend to react on the view of Holy Scripture. The body of doctrine habitually set forth as the true and orthodox interpretation of the Bible would

* Cf. Orig. Pref. to *De Princ.* ch. 2, Aug. *c. Faust.* XI. ii., XXXIII. 6.

† Cf. *c. Cels.* VIII. lxvi.

come to stand, as it were, alone. Liturgical associations also would gather round particular passages, and render a particular view of their meaning habitual. And Scripture itself would insensibly change its position in regard to the Church and to doctrine. Discussion—exposition—would be applied to the Creed, and be illustrated by quotations from Scripture; rather than to Scripture, with the intention of defining and defending the Creed. Formally, the authority of Scripture would be still unchallenged; it would still appear as the final element in a discussion. But the real hinge of discussion would not be in the sense of Scripture; it would depend upon the exercise of reflection and ratiocination upon the basis of the Creed. This result has actually taken place by the time that we reach the Scholastic age. Many causes contributed to it, of which we cannot now speak particularly; but there is no question as to the effect. If we study a commentary or a controversial work by Origen or Augustine, we may be totally unconvinced by the arguments. We may often think that the passages cited will not bear the sense put upon them; but we cannot doubt that the authors were satisfied, and had a right to be satisfied, with the methods they employed, and that they were seriously endeavouring to explain the meaning of the texts in dispute. In like manner, in reading an article in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, we may be impressed with its earnestness, its acuteness, and the general reasonableness of its doctrine; but we cannot but be astonished at the use made of Scripture. The question is argued upon its own merits, and Scripture brought in as an external (though final) authority—a place which it shares in some not very clear degree with Aristotle. The passage selected is often not of very obvious application to the point under discussion, and it is clear that the reference to Scripture is formal and not of decisive importance.

This method of using authorities was, again, characteristic of the whole age. As we have already noted, isolated fragments of Aristotle and other philosophers are brought in to help to the establishment of particular theses. And in the sermons of the period there is a continual reference to passages of Scripture, but always as phrases or mottoes of an external authority, rather than as living and operative principles of truth. They take their meaning, not from the context in which they originally occurred, but from some familiar use that had been made of them, or from the context into which they are brought by citation, or, again, from the literal meaning of the words, as it appears apart from the original context.* The point may be illustrated in the *Meditations and Spiritual Treatises of Richard Rolle, of Hampole*, edited by Horstmann.

Thus, in very brief outline, we have seen something of the use made of Holy Scripture in two very different ages of the Church. Its position as the guide of Church life and thought is theoretically the same throughout, current methods being used to bring it into harmony with the requirements of the time. We have seen, also, how it tended to be obscured by the strong influence of and discussion upon dogmatic abstracts of its own teaching, by the growth of habitual associations, liturgical and other,

* Cf., for instance, the discussion in the *Summa* as to whether marriage is a sacrament. Reasons are urged against the view that it is, and are ruled out by the quotation Eph. v. 22: "Sacramentum hoc est magnum"—a passage which does not really carry the conclusion. The theoretical reasons are then given, and the objections met. In this case Scripture has only formal authority. It must not be supposed that the historical view of the scriptural books was wholly lost at this time. It would be difficult to find better directions for the reading of Holy Scripture than in a letter of Guigo Carthusiensis, published with the works of St. Bernard, tom. ii. p. 218: "Quo enim spiritu scripturæ factæ sunt, eo spiritu legi desiderant; ipso etiam intelligendæ sunt. Nunquam ingredieris in sensum Pauli, donec usu bonæ intentionis in lectione ejus, et studio assiduæ meditationis spiritum ejus imbiberis. Nunquam intelliges David, donec ipsa experientia ipsos psalmorum affectus indueris. Et sic de reliquis."

round its phrases; and to these causes of disturbance must be added the intrusion of doctrines and beliefs of which no scriptural account could be given at all. These circumstances, apart from any others, were quite sufficient to produce a new state of things whenever any question should arise as to the meaning and method of interpretation of Scripture. Such a question was raised, it need hardly be said, at the Reformation. The rejection of additions which were manifestly innovations upon the order described in Scripture brought up at length the question of the principle of interpretation, and it is in the circumstances thus produced that we now live. It is perhaps true, as Father Gasquet has recently contended, that the ecclesiastical authorities had no desire to destroy or to forbid Scripture. They may have been talking even of licensing a translation under certain restrictions. But the free use of ordinary methods of study, without allowing any special value to the traditional glosses, was certainly forbidden; and the acquisition of this freedom is the real meaning of the "open Bible" which we claim to have won. The assertion of this principle in its full and real sense was not made clearly from the first. The versions put forward on the anti-papal side were in some cases glossed in the interest of some anti-papal sect. It took time to extricate the Church from the confusion and chaos of rival interpreters, all claiming an equal right to interpret and be heard. But the outcome of the whole warfare is briefly this: that the decision between various senses ascribed to the Bible must rest in the end with an authority qualified not merely by ecclesiastical position, but by learning adequate to the task of interpretation. This conviction is the source of all that is best in modern criticism.

The previous discussion has suggested what we conceive to be the true position of criticism applied to the Holy Scriptures. It is the natural and proper method by which

this age will make clear the message of God to man, as it is contained in His Holy Word. It is not, naturally, a wanton subjection of sacred things to irreverent handling, but implies rather a serious reverence for truth and a determination to use all possible means to ascertain the truth which God has to tell. But it does not require any exceptional vision to see that the Church has often looked coldly upon critical methods, and that critics have assailed the Church with vehement and bitter hostility. The whole of the so-called "problem of criticism" arises from this fact. From the point of view of history, nothing could be more natural, more necessary, we may say, than the application of criticism to the books which so many contending parties cited as authoritative. Unless some method or principles can be established to act as tests, only a general chaos can result. The solution of the problem consists in the endeavour to explain why a thing apparently so necessary and inevitable as criticism should seem to be so dangerous, and to increase discussion rather than allay it. To this "problem" we must now turn.

In the first place it will be well to recapitulate the chief points noticed in the Church's treatment of Holy Scripture. They may be said, roughly, to be three. (1) The Bible has always been regarded as a whole. However various the authors and the circumstances of their writing, it has always been assumed that in some sense a unity of principle and purpose runs through the whole. This, as we saw, was the justification of the allegorical method, and underlies the neglect of the actual text of Scripture which we noted in the Middle Ages. (2) As a result of this unity it was assumed that a consistent body of doctrine could be drawn from the Bible which might be treated as divinely accredited. If the Bible had been looked on as an accidental collection of

miscellaneous works by a variety of authors, such a view would have been impossible. As, however, it was a single whole, a unity including and superseding differences of time and outlook, it was possible to speak of the analogy of the faith, and use one part to explain and supplement another. Moreover, the truth drawn from it in this way was held to be final: that is to say, that God Himself could alone add to or diminish it. It was not an accidental result of analysis and reflexion upon a series of books accidentally conjoined: the truth derivable from Scripture was held to be the real determining object of Scripture; the promulgation of it was the end which God had in view in inspiring the authors to write and the Church to collect the books. It contained a revelation, which man could not have devised for himself, and had no power to alter. (3) The finality and inspiration of the revelation of God justified the preaching of it as a remedy for all the evils of man's life, and accounted for the actual power of this preaching in regenerating men and making it possible for them to overcome their sins. There could be no question in any age of the power of Christian truth, in the form in which it had been derived from the Bible, to achieve this spiritual work; and the range and variety of its success rendered it impossible to ascribe the result to any accidental character of individual minds. The faith of Christ saves because it is meant to do so, because it is a revelation both final and universal of that which man requires to save him.

These are the main assumptions which are involved in the continuous use of the Bible as the source of the Christian doctrine. It is easy to see how readily they might produce a feeling of security in the doctrine as delivered, and of indifference to the reopening of questions and the fresh discussion of issues in a new

light. And it is these fundamental assumptions which the critical school appears to assail.

We must next inquire what is the nature of the criticism of the Bible, and why it comes into collision with the assumptions just set out. The truth which the Bible conveys has necessarily its external and earthly side; criticism deals primarily with this. Thus it is the function of the critic to determine by use of the ordinary methods of scholarship what is the real text of the Bible. All ancient writings, transmitted as they were in manuscript, are liable to various forms of error. These have to be discovered and corrected in order that we may be as sure as the circumstances permit that the words we read are the real words written or dictated by the apostolic writers. So far the work of criticism is negative, and aims merely at the rejection of error: a textual critic who attempted to improve the text in the light of his own judgment would simply vitiate it, and destroy his own reputation. Criticism of this sort is simply negative and corrective. Yet even in this region there are sometimes surprises in store for those who hold closely to the old ways. The disappearance of the text (1 John v. 5) concerning the three heavenly witnesses, or of the Pericope Adulteræ (John vii. 53-viii. 11) are cases in point. This is the simplest form of criticism, the most familiar, and the longest in vogue. It is applied most easily, owing to circumstances, to the New Testament, and is only in recent times finding a field for its operations in the Old.

A more complex form of criticism is that which relates to the traditional authorship of books. Provided the methods of criticism are reasonable and the materials sufficient for a sound judgment, it is difficult to see what can be gained but good from the purification of the text. Persons who seriously believe that Scripture

is the source of Christian doctrine will be ready to forego beliefs which they may have cherished if they are shown to have no authoritative warrant in Scripture. If it had been the case that the passage 1 John v. 5 were the only evidence in Scripture for the Trinitarian doctrine, and if, further, the Church's definition of this doctrine could have been shown to rest on this text and on this alone, then no one could have complained if the disappearance of the text had involved the rejection of the doctrine. To show that the text was not genuine would, in the imaginary circumstances described, have proved that the doctrine had no place in the scriptural conception of God. There are, however, no cases in which a fundamental doctrine of the Church stands or falls with the presence or absence of one text. But the case is not quite the same with the question of authorship. The contents of a book are often closely connected with the authority of its writer. For instance, the Fourth Gospel not only contains lofty theological ideas, but also professes to be a historical account of certain scenes in our Lord's life, given by one who was present. It is idle in this case to argue that the truth and beauty of the theological conceptions are unimpaired, whoever wrote the book, because the special value and the precise contents of these depends largely on their relation to our Lord's life. It is otherwise, again, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, for in this case the historic setting is of less importance. Opinions will differ as to the degree in which the truth of the tradition of authorship affects the authority of different books, and therefore here is one case in which a collision between modern methods and ecclesiastical assumptions may arise. This possibility, however, will not justify the prohibition of critical methods; it will demand a steady and deliberate scrutiny of their principles and the application of them. Akin to this use of critical method is the analysis of

documents with a view to discovering the authorities used in them. Criticism will have to decide whether a book handed down as a single work is in reality the product of a single author, or a combination of a variety of works by different authors. This question also may occasionally cause a collision between the critics and the traditional views of Churchmen.

But there is a further region of historical criticism which is, in some respects, more important and more perilous than these. It is clear that a good deal of the force of the Christian appeal lies in the distinctiveness of Christian history and religion. The popular mind expects to find religious phenomena unique, and is apt to resent the association of its faith with secular history. "Profane authors" are occasionally allowed to "confirm the sacred narrative," but not more. And thus the comparison of religious beliefs amongst the Jews with those of contemporary heathen, and all attempts to explain obscurities in the worship of Jehovah by means of religious conceptions rife at the time elsewhere, have been treated as necessarily hostile in tendency. It has seemed almost of necessity a degradation to the religion of the Chosen People, if it should appear that the line of division between it and the neighbouring Pagan cults was less sharp and clear than had been supposed. Yet in all these matters, in comparative religion and in comparative history and archæology, results are continually being obtained of great importance, which no student of Christianity can ignore. And these are not merely of the type of new facts or new evidence, tending to throw doubt upon statements once accepted as certain; the evidence tends to require a new view of the way in which religion has developed in the world—a new conception, to put it shortly, of the distinction between the natural and the supernatural. It was easy to interpret the past, while

it could be assumed that these two provinces were always sharply distinct, and that the supernatural was always true, and the natural always false. Criticism proceeding from the quarter just named has certainly assailed this sharp distinction as well as many convictions that would have been regarded fifty years ago as unassailable.

Lastly, criticism comes from the metaphysical or *a priori* side. Not only is there questioning of the historical setting of the Christian beliefs in the interests of historical criticism, but the authority of the books is indirectly attacked on metaphysical grounds. The idea of miracles is inextricably interwoven with the historical records in Scripture, and with the Creeds as at present defined. And it is plain that if miracle is *a priori* impossible, these records, however safely they may have emerged from the furnace of the historical critic, are so riddled with impossibilities as to be practically worthless. It is true that criticism of this sort lies in strictness against the whole religious idea, and should be dealt with before any evidence is taken as to the strictly historical assertions in the Bible. But it happens, not unfrequently, that principles which are properly *a priori* make their appearance in the course of an ostensibly historical discussion, and therefore it is necessary to mention them here.

It will be observed that all the questions mentioned here as falling under the head of criticism of the Bible have this point in common, that they all concern the adjustment of the Bible to the general order of the world. It requires to have its place made clear, so that men may have, as it were, a general idea of the course of things, and know at what points religion touches other matters of interest. The questions discussed under the head of textual criticism and the so-called "Higher

Criticism" are questions as to the human elements in the transmission of the truth. Other books have come down to us through the work of scribes; discussions of authorship may be raised about them, and by such methods we learn their history and clear up our views as to their authority and trustworthiness. It is exactly the same with the Bible. It is a matter of importance, if we wish to know fully the meaning and value of it, to learn the story of its transmission. So the importance of the historical and anthropological discussions lies in the light sought through them upon the method of God in dealing with the world. The piecing together of Jewish history with that of the surrounding nations, the exposition of the likeness and unlikeness between Jewish and Gentile religions, *ought* to make somewhat clearer the general character to be expected in a revelation. And, lastly, the *a priori* discussions are calculated to show the limits of natural knowledge, and to exhibit, so far as may prove possible, the point of contact between the will of God and the life of man. Thus all the subjects which give rise to criticism are subjects of real importance, and the Bible is in real contact with them all. If it has really entered into the history of mankind as we believe, it must have a definite position in regard to all these points, which must be in some measure discoverable. And critical methods would seem to be the only ways open for discovering it, the only ways of performing in modern times the service which allegory and philosophising performed of old, namely, of exhibiting Revelation in relation to the life and knowledge and pre-conceptions of men.

But it will be said, If this be the true function of criticism, why is it so often negative? and why does the traditional view so often seem to be the worse for its work instead of the better? It is, of course, a matter

of obvious certainty that there seems at first sight no alliance possible between the critical and traditional attitude towards things. The man who accepts the traditional point of view dislikes change and distrusts it. That which was good enough for his fathers is good enough for him. If, besides this, traditional beliefs have still notoriously the power to produce their old effect, he is all the more disinclined to listen to any voice which seems to throw doubt upon them. On the other hand, the critic necessarily starts with a doubt. From whatever point of view he begins it is the same. That which is asserted on the basis of authority is to him always a subject for inquiry and discussion. The received text, the traditional ascription of a book, have no appreciable advantage because they are received; he wants to know why received, and on what grounds traditional; and therefore he seems to be the polar opposite of the man who accepts tradition; it looks as if they could never agree. Their difference of method, also, corresponds with a difference of temperament; they provoke one another by apparently despising each the chief object of the other's reverence. The one is charged with a deficient interest in truth, and the other with a lack of respect for ancient authority.

In cases of apparently insoluble controversy like this it is usual to suppose that errors will be found on both sides. The subject in question is no exception to this rule. And in this case, as in others, the faults arise out of the virtues belonging to each side. The dogmatist (as we may call him shortly for convenience sake) has a general conception of his subject as a whole; he considers its various aspects as they are connected together; he has always known them in connection, and therefore he thinks that an attack upon one element in his structure destroys it all. He does not readily

distinguish between the vital and the accidental ingredients in the whole. And he gains countenance because the critic on his side is apt to be overmastered by the interest of his own special line. He has investigated thoroughly some one feature of a traditional belief, its point of contact with some branch of learning with which he is acquainted. And he is apt at times to build a whole scheme of things upon his exact but limited knowledge, to assail a whole system of belief upon the ground of error detected in its outworks, and, by so doing, to justify the shyness on the part of those who hold to tradition of his whole methods and its results.

It is probable that this lack of proportion on the part of representatives of the two points of view accounts largely for the temper with which they often regard one another. But it is obvious, of course, that this is not an account of the whole matter. There is a real division of opinion and a diversity of approach to the questions lying round the Bible; and we must now endeavour to indicate, so far as may be possible, what appears to us to give hope of a *modus vivendi*. If, when stated, it should look painfully obvious, it may yet be that it has not been fully recognised. Before doing this, however, it seems right to allude to certain alternative suggestions from one side or the other.

1. It has been suggested that the Church should practically accept the extreme position of critical students, and resign all attempt to maintain the historical elements in its teaching. If by so doing it could retain the essential features of its doctrine, there can be no doubt that this plan would save a great deal of trouble. The historical side is the most vulnerable. The peculiar character of historical proof produces an impression of uncertainty and feebleness upon all except those who are specially trained. The discussion of historical questions is carried

on by means of minute research into small and apparently unimportant details. And from this very fact it is always easy to throw doubt upon a historical assertion as a whole by correcting it in some part. At least, it is always easy to give an appearance of instability to a structure that rests on the basis of evidence carefully weighed and sifted, instead of on a good general principle from which inferences follow by necessity. The discrepancies, for instance, in the Evangelists, the difficulty of verifying assertions made so long ago, the difficulty of realising in imagination a condition of things so utterly unlike our experience, the conflict of external evidence upon various points with that in Scripture, are all facts which help to make the historical side of the discussion seem vexatious and indecisive, if not absolutely disastrous to faith. And therefore one can easily understand the inclination to break loose from all this tortuous and trying complication, and to march forward with only a number of ideas to carry, which may be trusted to convince by their own inherent force. If we could exhort to the new life without the encumbrance of a historic Resurrection, or preach the true divinity of manhood without being involved in conciliar decisions and creeds, how much simpler a business preaching Christianity would be. And the prospect of simplification is always attractive. It is, however, sometimes a delusive attraction, and we are convinced that it is so here, at any rate in this form.

In spite of the real difficulties which beset historical questions, it is the historical element that has made Christianity what it is. It is easy, no doubt, to guide oneself, and to proclaim to others ideas which spring from lofty imagination, or are suggested by the contrast of painful experience. But mere ideas are inoperative, and have been proved so in the past. The ideas which work and have some chance of being effectual are those which

rise out of human experience and achievement, and fit on easily to the practical side of life. It is not intended, as Butler says, to vilify the reason, or to deny the necessity of principles and ideals: for indeed history would be a mere chaos if ideas were not traceable in it. But it is asserted that reason is limited in the construction of ideas by its *past* experience: it deals with the future by means of principles and rules derived from the past; and hence a new stage in reflection may be expected when events have so reorganised experience that all things are viewed from a new point of sight. The idea of God in man does not, of course, depend upon its realisation in fact. The idea of a new life is possible to any reflecting person who is dissatisfied with the old. Both these ideas prevailed, and were inoperative, before they were found to have been actualised in the experience of the apostles: since this, and because of this, a change has passed over the face of the world. Moreover, the function of religion is not to suggest new ideas only; for, after all, this is not what man wants, exclusively or mainly. He is certainly better with the ideas than without them: the existence of the ideas in his mind, however inoperative they may be, is a preparation to understand the historical realisation of them when it comes. It is in this sense, among others, that Greek philosophy, and even some of the Greek mysteries, were a real preparation for Christ. But the idea of a new life first becomes capable of lifting men out of the old one when they discover it to be not only an idea, but a reality of experience; and the idea of a Divine Word moving among men first becomes capable of uniting them with God when they learn that the thing has really happened, and that the Word Incarnate did not shrink from death. Through these historical facts, the renovation which the mysteries attempted, and the communion with God which no sacrifice could effect, was actually brought to pass.

A Christianity without a historic Incarnation and Resurrection seems to us to be doomed to failure, in spite of the fact that the most vigorous assaults of criticism are directed upon these points. The other gospel miracles, though they are placed in a completely new light, if the two facts mentioned above are assumed, can never take quite the same place in critical discussions. Considered alone, that is, apart from the Resurrection, they have evidence of very different degrees of cogency. Some are related by only one evangelist, others are related by more than one evangelist, but with discrepancies of detail. None of them form part of the fundamental contents of the Church's witness like the Resurrection. If the Resurrection be denied, they are improbable; if it be declared impossible, so too are they; if it be truly asserted, then they have the probability in their favour that belongs to facts reported by trustworthy authority. Thus it is upon the Incarnation and Resurrection that the real issue turns in regard to the New Testament: in regard to them we cannot accept the solution of the controversy which has been suggested.

The suggestion to drop the historical discussion and concentrate attention upon the ideas is made more insistently, and at first sight with more force, with regard to the Old Testament. The books of the ancient Jewish Canon date from a remote past; the history of their transmission is in many ways obscure; the attestation of their text is neither varied nor independent of the labours of ancient critics; the history described is less easy of verification, and is devoid of the completeness and primary authority of the Assyrian records; the conditions out of which the books arose is imperfectly known, as well as the method and qualifications of the authors. At the same time there is no doubt whatever that in the view of the apostles and of the whole Catholic Church since their day,

the new religion rose out of the old, and can only be fully understood by reference to it. Moreover, in the case of the Old Testament, there seems to be a greater probability that some of the analytical theories of authorship will prove generally acceptable, than is the case in regard to the New Testament. The recognition of more than one prophet in the Book of Isaiah, for instance, stands on a wholly different plane to Vischer's analysis of the Apocalypse. Hence the appeal to ignore historical difficulties, and rest upon the great formative ideas of Jewish religious genius is apparently of considerable strength. The belief in God as holy, the lofty prophetic conception of human life, the expectation of a Redeemer to come, the outlines of whose character were strengthened and sharpened as time went on—these and similar ideas, to the superficial glance, would seem capable of standing alone. Here, again, however, we cannot wholly accept the suggestion. The historic conception of Christ which is so clearly marked in the New Testament is part of the inheritance from the Old. The coming of Christ was not merely the fulfilment of certain ideas which had arisen in the heads of ancient inspired men; it was a new act on the part of God. God had dealt with His people by means of acts of self-revelation. The prophets were not men of religious ideas only, they were men who claimed to interpret God's acts in history. It was not that Jews had devised a peculiar idea of God; God Himself had dealt with them in action as with no other nation under heaven. The coming of Christ was the climax of a series of definite historical acts: the call of Abraham, the call of Moses, the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, the conflict of prophets and kings, the Captivity and the Return—all these were real events, like the birth and death and resurrection of our Lord, having a place in outward history; which occurred, and by their occurrence

revealed the presence and character of God. It is true that they might easily have happened and failed to convey the revelation, but, in God's way of working, the revelation would not have been conveyed if they had not happened. It would seem, therefore, that as regards the main lines of the Old Testament history we must insist on the historical character of the record, and cannot be satisfied with a mere evolution of ideas.

But the problem is not quite covered by this statement. There are in the Old Testament a number of events described which probably can never be verified: the story of Balaam and his ass, the miracles of Elijah, and so on. These cannot be classed among the fundamental facts of Old Testament history. Their remoteness, sometimes the great peculiarity of their form, the difficulty of understanding their purpose, are all facts about them which distinguish them very broadly from the miracles of our Lord. And it is always possible, therefore, that they may have been accretions. But the predominantly historic character of the Old Testament narrative precludes a summary rejection of them all; except, of course, on the ground of their *a priori* impossibility. And this makes all serious attempt to estimate the value of the Old Testament nugatory.

Once more; we have in the Old Testament a series of narratives to which there is no parallel in the New at all: the accounts of the Creation, the Fall, and the Flood. Upon these, criticism from every quarter has been bestowed with liberal hand. It is obvious that they lie beyond the ordinary methods of historic verification. That there is some historic background to the story of the Flood is coming to be generally asserted. But the other two narratives stand upon very different ground. And it would seem that here the existence of the legend-making faculty may be admitted as regards their form.

The precise description of the Garden of Eden, and of the acts which constituted the breach with God may have been due to the desire to express profound beliefs in the forms of undeveloped people. In saying this, we do not depart from the teaching of Origen, or Athanasius, or Augustine. But even if we admit that the form and the matter are less inextricably conjoined here than in the Gospel of St. John, for instance, we cannot admit that there is no historic reality corresponding to the essential meaning both of the Creation and the Fall. That the world was made by God, and its course diverted by the rebellion of finite wills, is the truth complementary to the truth that the world was saved by Christ. In neither case are we moving in the region of pure ideas; in both cases we move in the region of fact and historic actuality.

It will not be necessary to delay long upon the expedients for silencing criticism which are devised by its opponents. It is argued, for instance, that critics differ so much among themselves, that they may safely be left to refute one another. It is true, no doubt, that all are not agreed upon one constructive view of the extremely complicated history which the Bible describes. It is, perhaps, hardly to be expected that they should. But, though they may be at variance in detail, they are in agreement as to the general principle that traditional views on many subjects are liable to revision, and that some are crying out to be revised. The particular theory which will result will be the product of much discussion and much disagreement; but it is probable that it will be evolved at last.

Nor again need we discuss the policy which merely ignores criticism, and meets it with dogmatic assertions of its incapacity to deal with scriptural matters. For this, in the last resort, implies an attempt to deny the reality of the human side of revelation. If logically carried out

it would mean an utter breach between the order of revelation and that of human history. It would destroy a historic religion more fatally than any criticism. We should have to deal with a series of interruptions to the normal course of things, of which nothing could be said except that they were unaccountable.

It will already have become plain that the attitude of the Church towards criticism is one of considerable difficulty. The summary methods just considered avoid grappling with the real problem, and we must now endeavour to suggest some more satisfactory solution. It is manifest that the Church cannot do without adopting the critical method in some form. If, as we have maintained, this is the natural way in which the Bible is to be made to tell its story to the present age, this point hardly needs defence. But the question will arise, In what form, under what conditions or restrictions is the criticism to be made? It seems necessary to make a distinction here between the theoretical and practical sides of the work of the Church, between the entry of the Church, through scholars who are Churchmen, into the work of scientific criticism, and the task of making the knowledge thus acquired available for the use of ordinary men who have no scholarship. We will consider these two points separately.

It is clear, of course, that criticism is valueless unless the traditional views are really criticised. To inquire into the authorship of the Fourth Gospel with a suppressed assumption that no conclusion but one is in any way possible would not really advance matters. All interest and, what is much more serious, all real responsibility vanishes from an investigation conducted upon such terms. And, again, the person who enters safely upon such questions must do so because he cares about them; and though he must carefully guard against

forcing a conclusion that will satisfy his inclinations, he will be in a worse and not a better position for giving his final judgment if he is totally indifferent to its character. Impartiality depends neither on indifference nor on lack of special knowledge, but on earnestness and severe self-control. Thus indifference and blind adhesion to a received view are alike disqualifications for a sane criticism.

But it is not enough to say this. We must go further, and endeavour to find some indication of the right course in regard to one of the most difficult of all scientific questions. Should the true critic, when he starts upon his work, treat all answers to his questions as equally probable? The obvious answer is that he should, and that, if he does not, his criticism will be valueless. It would appear, however, on further examination that this answer is not quite so self-evident as it seems, and that care must be taken lest it should, after all, involve a fallacy. We may admit that over a large field of possible questions the very fact of asking implies that the answer is uncertain. For instance, where there are two variant readings, it may be the case, though it is not so necessarily, that they are equally probable *a priori*. This statement written out in full would come to this: there are two readings in this passage, each of which, at first sight, gives good sense; investigation of their attestation, etc., must decide which the author is most likely to have written. In this case a critic would set out upon his inquiry without any clear notion on which side the decision would fall. In some cases a mere glance at the *apparatus criticus* belonging to his text might suffice to show him that of the two readings, both unexceptionable from the point of view of sense, one had the strongest external probability in its favour. This discovery might close the discussion,

or might be insufficient and require additional support. In other cases prolonged investigation might leave the critic without decisive evidence on one side or the other. He would then leave off with the opinion that either reading might have stood in the autograph; in other words, that they were equally probable. This instance, though simple, is not an unreal one. And it is sufficient to show that the balanced state of mind, to which either of two solutions of a question is equally probable, is not free from ambiguity. Two answers may look equally probable, by reason of ignorance of the exact conditions of the case; or, again, because the conditions of the case, after being exhaustively investigated, do not prove sufficient to cause a decision.

In the case just considered the question is one which involves no complications with subjects of a totally different kind. The uncertainty which has to be determined upon the evidence is of the narrowest kind: whether the evidence suggests that the author wrote one word or another. But there is a large number of questions which cannot be thus conveniently isolated. A decision reached on one of these carries or seems to carry other decisions with it upon a host of points which have never been openly in dispute at all. In regard to any one of these, excessive caution is required, and rough-and-ready methods, however plausible, are almost certain to be inadequate.

In considering, further back, the nature of the criticism upon the Bible, we noticed a variety of sources from which it comes. This circumstance now becomes of the first importance. Criticism usually takes the form of a discussion of one of the points arising under one of these heads. Thus, for instance, we may have put before us a critical discussion of the composition

of the Pentateuch or the authorship of the Psalms. Strictly speaking these are matters of purely technical interest, and appeal to scholars. But they do not always rest there. Upon the conclusion a theory is frequently built as to the general nature of Jewish religion or the authenticity of the Bible as the Word of God. This point, however, has not been, in the case supposed, fully before the critic, nor can it be settled one way or another without considering a great deal of evidence that does not lie within the domain of textual or "higher" criticism. The authenticity of the Bible as a Revelation is a question which involves a particular view of the nature of God, the order of the world, and many other similar considerations. These have not been under consideration at all. And yet a person who decides that if (say) the Pentateuch is proved to be of composite authorship it loses its claim to deliver God's message, really decides by that conclusion a number of these other questions upon which no evidence has been heard. He declares inferentially that the Revelation of God could only have come in one way, in the way in which he and others have been accustomed to think of it as coming. And that means that his decision is a composite one; it rests partly upon the critical verdict, and partly upon a presupposition.

It is manifest that in dealing with such questions as are suggested by the Bible it will not often happen that any point can be studied in complete isolation. The book is inevitably bound up with so many interests and preconceptions, that it is almost impossible to avoid hidden bias in one or another direction. And thus even the open mind which the critic is expected to maintain may often conceal a vicious assumption. It is said that a critic should be equally prepared to

accept either of two alternative solutions of a question proposed to him ; and this is true, provided the alternative is really an exhaustive one. But if in any case one alternative covertly introduces one assumption as to matters not really under investigation, and the other alternative conveys in like manner the opposite assumption, then the equilibrium of the critic's mind conceals a *petitio principii*. No care and deliberation in the technical matters criticised will prevent this if a decision of a different kind is assumed by the acceptance of one particular alternative. An instance may make this clearer. The following phrase occurs in Dean Burgon's *Revision Revised*, p. 96, "O to participate in the verifying faculty which guided the teachers (*i.e.* the Revisers) to discern in twenty-five cases of transposition out of seventy-four the genuine work of the Holy Ghost." The use of it, and of many others like it, implies an attitude of mind in regard to the New Testament as a whole, which would impair the value of the most careful examination of technical points. Similar instances might be quoted from works bearing in the opposite direction to Dean Burgon, *e.g.*, from *Supernatural Religion*. These, of course, are cases in which the bias is so violent and unmistakable as to vitiate the critical processes altogether. But there are many cases in which absolute freedom from all tendency of thought in one way or another is impossible ; and the only way of dealing with these successfully is to secure that the dispositions of thought in question should be realised, allowed for, and continually tested as far as may prove possible. If this is done a critic may start upon a critical investigation without necessarily being equally ready to accept either of two alternatives. He may have a strong preference for one, and if this preference were operating in secret his work would almost certainly be ruined. But if he knows and

recognises his own tendency of mind, the effect will be that he will start with a provisional theory, which, if he is wise and honest, he will be prepared to modify or to resign. The subordinate issues will be dealt with apart altogether from their bearing on the theory; when these are settled to the best of his ability he will return to his theory, and see how the newly ascertained facts bear upon it, whether they modify it, and whether, if they are in flat opposition to it, they are in themselves sufficient to cause a complete reconstruction of his position.

These general principles, which are often forgotten or denied, are of the most vital importance in dealing with our present question. We have said that the only way in which the Church can grapple with the "modern critical problems" is by coming forward and criticising for itself. It is usually retorted that Churchmen are precluded from practising serious criticism because they act always under the influence of a presupposition, which makes free criticism impossible. We have endeavoured to show that the absolute balance which is set forward as our ideal is impossible except in regard to questions of a subordinate and abstract kind; and is difficult in proportion to the complexity and ramifications of the subject under discussion. If this contention be valid, it bears directly on the legitimacy of criticism within the Church. The belief which lies at the root of the Church's use of the Bible is ultimately the belief in the providence of God. The Bible is the record of a series of acts declaratory of God's purpose and love towards men. It is not, therefore, in the eye of the Church, a series of disconnected fragments of a literature, accidentally swept together by the stream of time. It has a meaning as a whole. Under all the variety of its authors there lies a steady unifying principle which holds it all together and justifies its use

as one. It is this belief, as we saw, that explains the apostolic use of the Old Testament; it is this again which makes the use of allegory intelligible to us, and even enables us to see the point of view of those in the Middle Ages who interpreted the Bible in the light of accredited dogma. This view of the Bible expressed in modern terms is in no way inconsistent with any criticism, except that which covertly or openly proceeds upon an opposite hypothesis. The belief that God has ordered the history of mankind with a special view, does not even suggest foregoing a careful and elaborate criticism of the records. Such a process would naturally be expected to show more clearly than before the precise mode of His action, the steps by which it was carried out, the method by which human agency was made to converge on divine ends. And therefore the critical method would not fail in thoroughness. The critic, although he has continually in view the idea of God's providence, will be prepared to learn by his criticism the difference between essential and non-essential elements in his conceptions of God's way of acting. To start investigating critical questions with the assumption that the traditional view of inspiration is incapable of modification, is to start with judgment fettered. But to start profoundly believing in the divine providence, and looking to criticism to define the mode of its action, its limits, its relation to man and to the presence of evil, may lead to as free and scientific a form of criticism as is possible to the human mind. It is, of course, conceivable that the result of such a criticism might seem incompatible with any theory of providence at all. This is a case no doubt which must be contemplated. If such a situation should arise, it will then become of importance to remember the abstract character of the criticism of the record. The evidence for the operation of God in history is wider than the record of it in con-

nection with the Jewish nation. Other considerations have to be brought to bear, and the decision of the question cannot turn upon the criticism of the books alone. Moreover, here will enter the verification in spiritual experience of the beliefs which Scripture suggests.

But though this is a case which must be contemplated, it is not one that has actually arisen. The results of criticism are on the whole conservative. In regard to New Testament criticism, the Preface to Harnack's *Chronologie* (though by no means so entirely confirmatory of tradition as has been sometimes supposed) closes a period of discussion in which the successive movements of critical judgment have continually approximated towards the traditional view. Whereas at the beginning of the century it looked as if the traditional view must be destroyed, at the end of it it is clear that those who hold to this view have a real case, capable of scientific statement and defence. It is probable that they have still much to learn from criticism as to the real conditions of the composition of the synoptic gospels, as to the degree in which inerrancy in historical matters must be necessarily expected in "inspired writers," and possibly also as to the text of the New Testament itself. But it no longer seems likely that the long-standing view of the New Testament will be destroyed by criticism. It is unnecessary to point out how much of this result is due to the sane and patient scientific work of three Cambridge scholars. It is true that the Old Testament has by no means reached a similar position; it is possible that it never may. It covers a vast period of time, and describes facts which have long since lost many of the links that bound them to the general stream of history. The questions which critics raise as to authorship have in many cases (*e.g.* the Psalms and other books) to be decided largely by internal evidence—a method which is notoriously precarious and liable to

lead to disagreement. But even in regard to the Old Testament it seems to us that the main backbone of the history of God's dealings with his chosen people is not seriously questionable; though in regard to the Old Testament, modifications of the traditional view are in some cases already necessary, and are probable in some others. It does not, however, seem that the significance of the Old Testament in the Christian Church is essentially modified by this state of things.

This last remark leads on to the consideration, for which only a brief space remains, of the practical use of the Bible in the Church, and the effect of criticism upon it. We have said already more than once that the central conviction upon which the use of the Bible rests is, that it is a record of the actual manifestations of God in history. The daily use of it in services and private meditation depends upon a continually varied application of this conviction to the circumstances of the Church and of individuals. The whole of its varied contents becomes available for modern life. By reflection upon it men are able to cast upon their own life the light of God's will. They see how Isaiah or S. Paul dealt with the circumstances of their own day, how the psalmist expounded in terms of religious feeling the covenant relation with God, how the ideal human life took shape in Jesus Christ. And all this use is possible because the Bible describes real things, and sets forth a relation between God and man that has been and may be again verified in experience. Criticism, if we have rightly conceived it, helps to define and articulate this relation. An exact knowledge of the text, for instance, of the Old or New Testament, is a continual preservative against the constant tendency of the human mind to desert the full solidity of Scripture and substitute some abstract and fatally simple theory of its own. So, again, a knowledge of the fairly assured results of

historical criticism will make clearer the stages and the various aspects of God's self-manifestation. If, for instance, a certain relation could be established between the Psalms and the history of their period, a vivid picture would be obtained of the way in which religion is applied to life; and this might be an ample reparation for the loss of the traditional idea of David. It might, if it had been established, be a source of practical teaching no less full than the old belief. But it will be observed that this effect comes from the results of criticism and not from its process. We think that this distinction cannot be too clearly realised. The process of criticism is, and must always be, a professional pursuit. Men who are specially educated, and those only, can appreciate the arguments, and estimate duly the various tentative theories which critics put forward on their way to the final solution. Any theory, however harmless in reality, may sound destructive if it is delivered to a mind which has never had experience of critical methods or of the short-lived tenure of many a conjectural solution of critical problems. This is the condition of a large majority of Churchmen. And that is the reason why incalculable harm may be done if a preacher takes his crude Wellhausen or Cheyne with him into the pulpit. Without any disparagement to those scholars, it may be said that their work is cast in a scientific and technical form, which inevitably scares and puzzles those who are unaccustomed to it. The plain man will, perhaps, be forced to modify some of his cherished convictions at last; but this result must be achieved by a long process, not by the sudden presentation of undigested lumps of crude theory. In other words, the practical use of the Bible is only gradually affected by the progress of criticism. It is not until results are securely attained and interpreted, that is, placed in intelligible and continuous relation with what men have

held before, that the new knowledge becomes of practical use. Then it will be found possible, we do not doubt, to continue the liturgical use of psalm and prophecy and history with a new and more vivid sense of their original force, and, for that very reason, a fuller appreciation of their application by the Church. We are a long way from this result at present. There yet remains much to be done in the way of preparing the minds of men for change by the use of results already fairly sure. And the progress has been delayed rather than furthered by the sudden display of critical views in a startling or repulsive form. A sense of insecurity has been developed by the propagation of hasty inferences from premisses imperfectly established, and by the continual process of self-revision, through which the best critics attain their end. Perhaps, too, the love of novelty may, in some cases, have inspired efforts to catch attention by causing surprise. It will not be in this way that the cause of science or religion will be served. The age requires criticism in the interests both of religion and of science; and the required method will be both thorough and free. But the most lasting results may be looked for from a criticism which deals, not only with traditional opinions, but also with its own premisses and its own logic, and which avoids the mistake of making comprehensive problems turn on subordinate discussions. For such a criticism there is room within the pale of the Church.

XII.

The Church and the Empire

BY B. R. WILSON, M.A.

I.

ENGLISH national life has been revolutionised during the past three centuries by the process known as the Expansion of England.

The tide of English life—political, commercial, industrial—has been setting with steadily increasing volume and velocity into the widening channel supplied by the ever-growing empire.

A process of restatement of ideas has been going on with regard to our current conceptions of the British constitution, of British politics, and literature, and commerce, in the larger terms suggested by the word "Imperial." And the nation is learning the lesson sometimes in a stern school. We are waging an Imperial war. British soldiers bred in four continents are fighting side by side under the British flag to vindicate British freedom. Federation is in the air. What seemed but yesterday to be the distant ideal of a few visionaries is rapidly becoming an established fact of mighty import, forced into expression by the day of trial.

Has the Church shown a like power of adaptation? Does the average Churchman realise the paramount im-

portance, the inspiring interest of the problem suggested by "the Church and the Empire"?

Can the Church, which has been the moulding influence of English national life—which has made for unity, for freedom, for education—rise to the level of a great opportunity and become the informing power of the greatest empire in the world, exercising a like moulding influence upon Imperial development? And if so, on what terms and with what necessary limitations can it aspire to fulfil its mighty mission?

II.

The antecedent probability is distinctly favourable.

For (i.) the direction of expansive development in which the national life is setting is essentially congenial to the spirit of the Church.

For the Church is essentially expansive. The Christian "Standing Orders," as the great English general well called them, enjoin a steady advance to "make disciples of all nations."

Expansion is an accident of national life. It is an inherent vital necessity of the Church. When expansion ceases the vigour of its inner life fades, and the faith which is not strong enough to compel its propagation is in danger of becoming too weak to dominate the life, and at last of dying out or crystallising into unfruitful superstition.

Nothing is more notable than the missionary enthusiasm of the first and keenest days of the Christian Society. If the tradition of apostolic work, which was current in the days of the first Church historians of the third and fourth centuries, may be trusted as substantially correct, already, within the lifetime of the first preachers of the

gospel, Christian communities had sprung into being from India to Spain, and from Russia to the heart of Africa. And a similar enthusiasm in furtherance of the gospel is characteristic of the earliest days of most Christian Churches.

(ii.) Nor is the conception of the Christian Church, as the informing power of a world-wide empire, derived from any less high authority than that of the greatest and most untiring Christian missionary, the Apostle Saint Paul. At the moment when it started upon its course—to all appearance a mere schismatic sect of an obscure and isolated people, full of narrow prejudices—in serious danger of being stamped with all those narrowing ideas and influences of Judaism which would have made it at best a national religious movement—it was his genius to catch the conception of the great Roman empire, with its perfect organisation of provinces and regions, as the ideal framework round which might be built up the fabric of a Catholic Church. To this end he waged a ruthless warfare against the cramping bigotry of Judaisers. With this purpose in view he hurried on, bearing his message from province to province, planting the banner of the cross in the heart of the Imperial city, that from the golden milestone in the Forum the good news might pass along the radiating Roman roads to the uttermost parts of the earth. He is impatient of delay. Centres of Christian influence must be planted in every province. He devotes himself to the great centres of the world's busiest life. From Asia to Macedonia and Achaia, from Rome to distant Spain he hastens on, leaving the Christian leaven to do its work, with the result that during his own lifetime marvellous progress had been made towards the realisation of the Master's great anticipation, "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations," and that

within three centuries "the world awoke to find itself Christian."

(iii.) Nor is this restless energy of missionary enthusiasm peculiar to apostolic days; it is a significantly frequent characteristic of the early history of the Church, in all parts and in all times, as land after land was awakened to new life and vigour by the gospel message. A wave of missionary enthusiasm marks the maturity of the Church. And usually the particular national environment sufficiently indicates the natural line and direction of spiritual expansion—the missionary responsibilities of each particular Church. Community of race forms naturally the clearest ground of call. We may trace and illustrate the process by the story of Christian effort in our own land. The obscure history of the Celtic Church is sufficiently clear to allow us to discern a strong and vigorous Christian community, which reaches the zenith of its power and influence in its missionary heroes who go forth to the evangelisation of kindred Celtic peoples. Patrick stands out pre-eminent as the Apostle of the Irish. Ninian evangelises the Picts of the Lowlands of Scotland. Columba and Kentigern take up and carry on the work. Other missionaries make the name of "Scotia" famous in Switzerland and Italy. The Saxon invasion crippled the power and damped the enthusiasm of the British Church, and as a result it sank into a depressed and isolated community.

The Saxon Church in turn became the mother of missionary leaders, to whom the Continental Teutons formed the natural object of effort. England supplied the Apostle of Germany in the person of Boniface. But, again, the savage incursions of the Danes had a paralysing effect; and with the deadening of missionary ardour the Church, of which the clergy had been "the wonder of the world" for vigour and for learning—which had sent forth

from the famous school of Eghbert an Alcuin to guide the counsels and educate the ruler of the Western world—sank into an illiterate and unprogressive body, isolated and without influence in the counsels of Christendom.

From the days of the Norman Conquest down to the times of the Tudors—a period of 450 years—the activities of the English Church were chiefly confined to work at home. It produced great prelates and great statesmen; it won for the people their freedom, fostered the development of constitutional government, promoted education. But of expansive missionary work there is little or no record, in spite of the fact that Continental nations remained heathen down to the fourteenth century. But the times were unfavourable to missionary enterprise. The sword was regarded as the legitimate weapon for the propagation of the Faith. The enthusiasm of Christendom lay rather with the Crusades. Similar methods were adopted for the conversion of the pagans of Europe by the knights of the Teutonic order. And the final overthrow of heathenism among the German races was due rather to the power of the sword than to the faithful preaching of the gospel.

(iv.) It appears then that the missionary enthusiasm which makes for constant expansion is not only essentially bound up with the most vital principles of the Christian religion, but also that this impulse has been characteristic of Church life, especially at times of crisis and newly-awakened vigour, and that it has found its readiest expression in working along lines of national life or racial connection. And this would lead to the anticipation that the expansion of England would have supplied just the inspiring impulse to a quickened missionary enthusiasm. For the whole movement was largely due to the upheaval of the national life caused by the great religious crisis of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The revival

of learning and the invention of printing, leading to the provision of increased educational facilities, had profoundly stirred men's minds on religious questions. Political exigencies precipitated the crisis. But, however largely it was degraded by the influence of lower motives, the English Reformation was essentially a religious movement; and to the political results of the Reformation the expansion of England is primarily due.

Nor are indications wanting that a directly religious motive did act as an impelling force in that expansion. Other and lower motives were, no doubt, predominant; and too soon the definitely religious idea passed out of view. But it would be unfair to forget that in the earliest charter ever granted for the foundation of an English colony, in 1583, it was expressly provided that the laws of the new settlement in Newfoundland should "not be against the true Christian faith or religion now professed in the Church of England"; and the "Advertisement" of the new enterprise cited as one of its chief objects "the carriage of God's Word into these mighty and vast countries," "it seeming probable that God hath reserved these Gentiles to be reduced into Christian civility by the English nation."*

And in the same connection it is significant to note in how many cases the new settlements, which quickly began to fringe the coast line of the American continent, were the result of a religious conviction, for which the political conditions of the time allowed no free expression in the old land.

To Virginia, founded in 1606; to New England, originally colonised by Churchmen in 1607, and further developed by the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620; to Maryland, which dates from 1632; to Pennsylvania in the opening years of the following century, men of all

* *The Church in America*, LEIGHTON COLEMAN, p. 4.

classes went forth. Many of them, no doubt, were political refugees. But the prevailing motive which led them to seek fresh homes beyond the sea was religious. The bulk of the emigrants were Puritans, disaffected towards the established order at home.* While Archbishop Laud was striving to tighten the reins of Church discipline, "the godly people in England began to apprehend a special hand of Providence in raising the Plantation" in Massachusetts. "I shall call that my country," said one of the leaders of the emigrants, "where I may most glorify God and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends." It is recorded that 20,000 Englishmen emigrated at this time within the space of eleven years.†

III.

Anticipations then, drawn from the character of the Church and from the indications afforded by its history in the past, would lead us to expect that the Reformation would have ushered in an epoch of missionary enthusiasm unique in its annals. It was a tremendous crisis. The open Bible now placed in the hands of the people in the vulgar tongue, and the opposition evoked in the unreformed part of the Western Church, combined to produce just that temper of mind which stimulates to missionary enterprise. There was the sense of mission. The old gospel truths, illuminated by the new learning,

* A recent historian of the American Church points out, however, that "there is no room for the contention that colonisation in those parts (New England) arose among Nonconformists," and later the "facts prove that the Church in her provision for the spiritual welfare of the people was considerably in advance of the Puritans, for whom the honour of making such provision is frequently claimed. The foundations of both Church and State were laid even in New England before the Leyden pilgrims had set sail" (see *Church in America*, by LEIGHTON COLEMAN, pp. 11 and 16).

† See GREEN'S *Short History of the English People*, chap. viii. sec. 4.

appeared as a new message entrusted to the Reformed Church, to which testimony must be borne in face of every obstacle. And the opportunity afforded by the rapidly growing communities springing up in the New World—largely composed of men of religious principle, though often of narrow prejudice, and opposed to much that was essential to Church order and Catholic teaching—constituted a call of unique urgency. It is the more disappointing to find that when we pass from anticipation to fact the Church, as an organised whole, failed to embrace the golden opportunity, and to justify its claim to become the moulding force in the future development of the empire. A brief survey of the facts shows too clearly how sadly fatal were its shortcomings in this respect. For two whole centuries the American Colonies, growing rapidly in extent, in population, in importance, were denied the right of full Church organisation. No bishops were sent out, in spite of repeated appeals from the settlers. By a curious legal fiction all British subjects on the high seas were regarded as parishioners of Stepney, and subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, who possibly on this account, by an extension of the principle, was designated by Orders in Council, of the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II., to exercise episcopal authority over the scanty body of clergymen sent out from time to time to minister in the new land. More probably, however, the munificence of Dr. King, the Bishop of London, who, in the year 1634, gave £1,000 for the propagation of the gospel in the American Colonies, may have led to his selection as the most fitting prelate to direct the course of colonial Church extension.*

It is not easy to gain or to convey a very clear and well-balanced idea of the story of Church extension

* See *The Church in America*, p. 19.

in those difficult days. Affairs alike in Church and State presented the appearance of a tangled skein. The Church, profoundly shaken by the disturbance of the Reformation crisis, needed time to readjust its ideas and to take its bearings. Emancipated from the papal dominion, the strong and exaggerated idea of Royal Supremacy threatened to impose a still heavier yoke. The full liberty of self-government had so long been lost that for a time, like a rudderless ship, the Church seemed to drift, unable to direct its course or to pursue unhampered the policy of expansion and consolidation demanded by the needs of the time, and indicated by evangelical principle. That missionary enthusiasm was lacking must be emphatically denied. The early settlers were moved by a real desire to propagate their faith, and to carry the gospel message to the heathen. The charters of Virginia and other subsequent settlements bear abundant testimony to the full recognition of this as a leading motive to be kept in view. A single illustration of the spirit which animated these early ventures must suffice. The charter granted to Virginia in 1606 expressly stipulated that "the true Word and service of God be preached, planted, and used according to the rites and doctrines of the Church of England; not only in the said Colonies, but also as much as might be amongst the savages bordering upon them"; and that "all persons should kindly treat the savage and heathen people in those parts, and use all proper means to draw them to the true service and knowledge of God." And, as an evidence that a like motive inspired many of those who actually embarked upon colonial enterprise, the chronicler of one such expedition writes: "We would not hazard so hopefull a businesse as this was, either for our private or particular ends, being more regardfull of a publicke good, and promulgating God's holy Church

by planting Christianity, which was the interest of our adventurers as well as ours.”* A like spirit of devotion led many clergymen to devote their lives to work in the new lands. Earnest and loyal congregations were formed, and continued to grow throughout the seventeenth century. Thus a body of 800 communicants was reported at Philadelphia in 1726.† All through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the one great desire of the Churchmen of the plantations was to obtain due episcopal supervision. And their repeated appeals were earnestly supported by the leaders of the Church at home. As early as 1638 Archbishop Laud had elaborated a scheme for the formation of a bishopric for Virginia. In the reign of Charles II. a clergyman was actually designated for the post.‡ In the reign of Queen Anne the question appeared to be so definitely settled that an episcopal residence was provided. And throughout the eighteenth century, from the date of its foundation in 1701, it was the special function of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to plead the cause of American Churchmen, and to press for the granting of the Episcopate to the New World. In fact, throughout this period, while the appeals and sorrowful protests from America—“from the poor Church of God here in ye wilderness”—were growing in force and urgency, successive archbishops and bishops at home were making strenuous efforts to secure the desired end. Nor are there wanting in the roll of early missionaries names of eminent

* Quoted in *The Church in America*, p. 5.

† See *The Church in America*, p. 45.

‡ Dr. Alexander Murray, who had shared exile with the King, was nominated Bishop of Virginia, and a Patent was made out constituting him as such. The scheme failed, owing to the proposal to provide the endowment out of the Customs.

For the account of these successive efforts to supply the need, see *Digest of S.P.G. Records*, chap. xciv. p. 743, and *The Church in America*, chap. v.

men who devoted to the Colonial Church years of fruitful work. There was Dr. Bray, whose appointment by the Bishop of London as Commissary for Maryland, in 1696, produced so powerful an advocate of the spiritual needs of America that, as the outcome of his labours, the two greatest of our Church Societies—that for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the daughter Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, of both of which he was an original member—came to be formed. There was the great philosopher bishop, Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, who, as Dean of Derry, spent three years of his ministerial life in Rhode Island, expecting the realisation of a cherished scheme for the establishment of a college in the Bermudas for the benefit of the Colonial Church—a dream which unhappily was never destined to be fulfilled. Nor ever during his later years, amidst his episcopal responsibilities, and amidst the absorbing interest of metaphysical speculation and his zealous advocacy of the salubrious properties of tar water, did his unchanging interest in the fortunes of the American Church abate. There were those earnest evangelists John Wesley and George Whitfield, to both of whom their after career was powerfully influenced by their experiences in the American mission field.

And yet, in spite of the persistent efforts made, in spite of the enthusiasm and of the eminence of those who were advocates of the cause, the State continued to interpose perpetual barriers. The Revolution of 1646 made it for the time impossible. Difficulties of endowment caused its postponement under Charles II. The hostility of James and the indifference of William led to further delay. The premature death of Queen Anne and the subsequent bitter opposition of American Puritans deferred indefinitely the necessary reform.

From this brief survey of the history of troublous times

the too hasty conclusion may possibly be drawn that the close connection of Church and State, which imposed such constant disabilities upon ecclesiastical development, was an unmixed evil. The entire emancipation of the Church from State control would have allowed a freer and more rapid process of expansion to take place. This is unquestionably the case, and yet there is much to justify an opposite conclusion. The stormy days of the Reformation stirred such violent passions and such bitter oppositions amongst those who held divergent views on burning questions of religion, that a strong external controlling force was needed for the Church's welfare. The State connection was a powerful factor in the maintenance of the integrity of the Church during the time of crisis. The process of rapid disintegration which marks the history of the Nonconformist bodies, the collapse of the Nonjurors in spite of the eminence and piety which distinguished the leaders of that movement, illustrate the perils from which the Church was saved, though at a heavy cost. The gradual attainment of the necessary freedom of development by slow and painful steps, while it delayed the expansion of the Church till calmer days, and led to the upgrowth of the great societies which proved so powerful an agency for Church extension, above all retained for religion in England through the State connection "the vivifying and elevating spirit breathed into it by close contact with the great historic and secular influences which act like fresh air on a contracted atmosphere, and are thus the Divine antiseptics against the spiritual corruption of purely ecclesiastical communities."*

Meanwhile, in relation to our first Colonial Empire, the Church was weighed in the balance and found wanting, and by the American War of Independence, the

* STANLEY'S *History of the Jewish Church*, Pref. to vol. iii.

opportunity which the Church had failed to seize was taken away. American Churchmen received from Scotland in 1784, by the consecration of Bishop Seabury, that which England had for two centuries withheld, and the marvellous development of the American Church during 120 years of constitutional government stands out as an abiding witness to the result of a faithful following of the Apostolic rule. At the time of Bishop Seabury's consecration there were barely 100 ordained clergymen of the Church in the United States. In 1898 there were 84 American bishops and 4,766 clergymen of the American Church.

Such a record of rapid progress is wonderful and inspiring. But it can never entirely atone for or obliterate the terrible disabilities and the fruitful evils resulting from religious divisions, which have been entailed upon America by past neglect. Thus, in 1675, only twenty-six years before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel began its work, it was reported that "there were scarce four ministers of the Church of England in all the vast tract of America, and not above one or two of them at most regularly sent over."* It was this appalling condition of spiritual destitution, and the consequent laxity of public morals, which prompted John Wesley a century later, in the very year which witnessed the consecration of Bishop Seabury, to lay hands on Dr. Coke, who thereafter claimed the title of Methodist Bishop. From this unfortunate and hasty act resulted the strongest of the Protestant denominations in America, and one which has greatly impeded the progress of the Church. The whole story of Church failure in America brings out in strong relief the fatal consequences of spiritual apathy and neglect of apostolic principles, while it increases our admiration for the splendid loyalty of Churchmen who

* *Digest of S.P.G. Records*, p. 2.

through two centuries of sickening delay remained steadfast to Church and Creed.

(ii.) *India*. But already before the removal of England's opportunity in America, the second "great door and effectual" had been opened to the Church by the acquisition of another English empire in India. By the victory of Plassey, won by Clive in 1757, England became virtually mistress of that vast heathen land, with its teeming population, its venerable traditions, its strong religious bent.

For the second time the Church was on its trial, and again we are compelled to write against it a record of failure. Again there was the paralysing failure to recognise the Historic Episcopate as the very kernel and condition of the Church's life and welfare and power of consolidation. Again this failure resulted from the hampering political conditions which allowed no liberty of natural development to the National Church. But as apathy grows apace under conditions of spiritual neglect it must be confessed that a spirit of complete indifference to the needs of India, an absolute ignoring of all the moral responsibility involved in the accession to empire, was now well-nigh universal in the nation, and infected all classes. Missionary enterprise, so far from kindling any spirit of loyal enthusiasm, was actually tabooed in Christian England, and that beyond the limits of the National Church. When Carey the Baptist was moved to plead for the evangelisation of India in the last decades of the eighteenth century, he was rebuked and silenced by the leading Baptist ministers on the ground that when God wished to convert the heathen He would do it without human aid.* And when

* At a meeting of Baptist ministers in Northampton in 1786, Carey proposed the following subject for future discussion: "Whether the command given to the Apostles to teach all nations was not obligatory on all succeeding ministers to the end of the world." The aged chairman, Mr. Ryland, shouted out the rebuke, "You are a miserable enthusiast for asking such a question. Certainly

he nobly succeeded in devoting his life to the cause which he had at heart, every obstacle to his missionary efforts was thrown in his way. A like amazing record characterises the work of Henry Martyn, the pioneer missionary of the Church, who devoted the last six years of his short life to work in India. It is recorded that during the time of his ministry, 1806-11, "there were not more than eleven Protestant missionaries employed on the part of England among the heathen in India."* Indeed, for the first century of our rule, it may broadly be asserted that any direct efforts made for the conversion of the natives were viewed with undisguised alarm, and regarded almost in the light of an offence against the State as likely to imperil our relations with the native races. The Indian Episcopate, however, was founded as long ago as 1814, and to the original diocese of Calcutta the bishoprics of Madras and Bombay were added in 1835 and 1837. The horrors of the Indian Mutiny seemed at last rudely to awaken the conscience of England to a sense of moral responsibility for her vast Dependency, and thenceforward the cause of Indian missions has been prosecuted with increasing earnestness.

(iii.) *Australia and South Africa.* Once more, at the dawn of the nineteenth century, opportunities on a vast scale presented themselves to the Church of England, when the continent of Australia—annexed in 1787—and Cape Colony, which finally passed from Dutch to English rule in 1806, were opened to British enterprise and colonisation. Perhaps the story of Australia affords the saddest and most glaring record of moral apathy and spiritual neglect. Not only were bishops withheld for well-nigh fifty years, but the supply of clergy was

nothing can be done before another Pentecost." (*Life of W. Carey*, by Dr. SMITH, p. 31.)

* *Digest of S.P.G. Records*, p. 472.

altogether inadequate, and the widespread degradation which was the natural result of the transportation policy, produced a community of criminals whose depraved condition forms a truly appalling picture. One hundred thousand convicts were transported to New South Wales. In 1834, of a total white population of 38,000 no less than 21,000 were convicts. Drunkenness, thefts, and murders were everyday occurrences. During the three years, 1833-4-5, the number of persons convicted of capital offences in the colony amounted to 399, or more than one per cent. of the whole community.

"It would seem," said the Supreme Court judge in his address to the grand jury in 1835, "as if the main business of all the community were the commission of crime and the punishment of it." And he goes on to allege as "one grand cause of such a state of things, an overwhelming defect of religious principle in the community." *

In 1836 Bishop Broughton was consecrated as the first bishop of Australia, and in 1839 the transportation of convicts to New South Wales ceased. By 1842 the population of the colony had increased to 120,000, of whom 70,000 or more claimed to be members of the Church of England.

South Africa had still some years to wait for its first bishop, until in 1847 Bishop Gray was consecrated to the See of Capetown, endowed through the liberality of a private benefactress. The colonists, however, had at least the advantage of occasional episcopal visits, owing to the fact that the Cape of Good Hope was the regular port of call for all ships bound for India and Australia.

Such in briefest outline is the record of the earliest successive stages of the spiritual expansion of the Church

* Quoted from *Digest of S.P.G. Records*, p. 390.

which so entirely failed to keep pace with the rapid growth of the British Empire. How utterly inadequate the earlier efforts in the cause of Church extension were, may perhaps best be emphasised by one significant and familiar fact. At the beginning of the year 1837—the year of the Queen's accession—there were but seven bishops of the Church of England established in all the colonies and dependencies of the Empire. Of these two were in British North America, where the first colonial see, that of Nova Scotia, was founded in 1787; two bishops occupied the West Indian Islands; two sees represented the National Church in India; while the first bishop of Australia had just gone forth to take the oversight of the spiritual needs of Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and all the islands of the Pacific.

It is the terrible extent of past neglect and its disastrous consequences of division, scepticism, and indifference to the claims of religion and morality that accentuate the difficulties of the problem suggested by the relation of Church to empire. Can a Church which has so far forfeited its claim to mission still dare to aspire to be the leavening influence and spiritual guide of a world-wide empire? Can it hope to make any adequate atonement for shortcomings in the past? The study of these dark pages of its past history must surely fill the mind of every loyal Churchman with a feeling of shame and humiliation, but also with a sense of overwhelming responsibility. It should stimulate to a supreme effort to retrieve (if it may be) the past by unflagging zeal in the present. It should induce a feeling of absolute patience in face of obstacles which largely result from past neglect. Happily the record of the last sixty-three years is a much more cheering one to Churchmen, and may go far to assure them that the splendid opportunity is ours still, and that, in spite of many disadvantages, the Church may yet fulfil that

mission which by right belongs to it as the Church of the English people.

Many favourable causes have conspired to promote more rapid Church extension during the Victorian era. Three specially deserve notice as indicating important steps in the direction of enabling the Church to become an imperial influence. The historic letter of Bishop Blomfield, written in 1840, on the necessity for providing for an increase in the colonial episcopate resulted in the formation in the following year of the Colonial Bishops Fund. Through its agency a sum of nearly £800,000 has been provided, and one chief obstacle has been removed to the rapid extension of the episcopate.* The emancipation of colonial and missionary bishops from dependence upon Letters Patent and a royal mandate, as the necessary preliminary condition to their consecration, which resulted from legal decisions given in 1863 and the following years, freed the Colonial Churches from hampering restraints, and ensured their more rapid development. And the decennial conferences of all Anglican bishops, inaugurated in 1867, enables the spiritual heads of the whole Communion to take common counsel with regard to matters affecting the welfare and progress of the Church. Thus a closer feeling of unity has become possible, and special needs and difficulties can be brought more directly before the whole Body. The outcome of these several movements, all making for progress, coincided with a quickened sense of missionary responsibility stimulated by the heroic lives of the great pioneer bishops of the Colonial Church, and the resulting develop-

* The immediate result of the establishment of the fund was the foundation of the Sees of New Zealand in 1841, and of Tasmania, Antigua, and Guiana in 1842. The latter diocese was presided over by its first bishop for fifty-one years. Bishop Austen is almost the only prelate in Christian history who has celebrated his episcopal jubilee in the see to which he was originally consecrated.

ment of sixty years is indeed a marvellous record of rapid growth. In place of the seven bishops of 1837 there are now ninety-eight bishops of our communion labouring abroad, chiefly within the limits of the British Empire, exclusive of the American bishops. The spiritual expansion of the Church has become a great reality.

IV.

It is hardly too much to say that upon the faithful and enthusiastic prosecution of this work, the future welfare and stability of the State, no less than of the Church, must ultimately depend; for neglected opportunities of spiritual expansion are among the surest causes of national weakness and consequent decadence. The welfare and stability of any State must, in the long run, depend upon the moral character impressed upon its subjects, and apart from strong religious influence there is no force powerful enough to mould the character of peoples. No more forcible apology for missionary enterprise could be given than that which is directly implied in Mr. Benjamin Kidd's remarkable book on *Social Evolution*. Proceeding from the standpoint of purely scientific inquiry, the writer demonstrates that the nations of progress must be those which are most strongly imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice, and that it is to religion alone that the task pertains of engendering this spirit. He proceeds further in the direction of proving that it is those nations which have been influenced by the teaching of the Reformation movement, which are most capable of producing citizens fired with the spirit of self-sacrifice. If the argument be sound, and we see no cause to question the careful train of reasoning by which the conclusion is reached, it must apply with peculiar force to a great empire like that of England composed

of "a company of peoples." There, if anywhere, stability and progress are dependent upon self-sacrifice. For the welfare of the Empire constantly requires the subordination of private or local interests in deference to the needs of a cosmopolitan community. And as a necessary result the enthusiastic support of missionary enterprise becomes an Imperial duty, a patriotic service to be rendered by everyone who desires to promote, in however small a measure, the stability and continued progress of the empire. It is the task of the missionary to impress those Christian principles which can alone inspire an adequate motive for self-sacrifice; and in rendering his service to the Church, he appears in the too often unnoticed character of a true patriot, effecting more for the welfare of his country than a whole regiment of soldiers.

To neglect so potent a force for the formation of national character is certain to result in national loss. It is no doubt a difficult task justly to gauge the operation of spiritual and moral laws in the field of political history. It is well-nigh impossible to isolate the particular cause and effect from the many eddying currents of the national life. Hasty and unwarrantable conclusions may too readily be drawn. But surely it is possible to discern in our own history indications of the operation of a process of retribution which reveals the fact that the failure of the Church to rise to its missionary vocation has led inevitably to political difficulties and complications, if not to the downfall of national prosperity and to the withdrawal of neglected opportunities.

(i.) *Ireland.* At our very door lies the sister kingdom of Ireland with its disaffected population, a perpetual source of anxiety and bewilderment to successive generations of English statesmen. Irish difficulties are obviously in large measure due to the prevalence of a foreign creed and to a religion which is antagonistic to English ideas.

Whence did the difficulty spring? It arose through the absolute neglect of the spiritual needs of the Irish people by the Reformed Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We gave to the Irish a Prayer-book in a foreign tongue. The ministrations of the Church were offered to them by bishops and clergy who never even learnt to speak the language of the people whose spiritual welfare had been entrusted to their charge. The Roman Church acted with more missionary zeal and on truer evangelical lines. Their priests and friars taught the Irish people in their own mother tongue. And the inevitable result has been that a naturally loyal and affectionate people, originally not ill disposed towards the Reformation movement, has been alienated from us by religious differences due to our neglect; and the antagonism thus brought about has been accentuated and embittered by political harshness and injustice in the past, and even by barbarous cruelty practised with the avowed intention of crushing religious opposition.

(ii.) *America.* Or take the case of the American colonies, which made good their title to independence after 200 years of spiritual neglect. It may be said that the American Revolution was the immediate result of the passing of the Stamp Act; but it will hardly be denied that the spirit of disaffection which was abroad was due to wider causes than so insignificant a measure. A long course of unsympathetic government had already alienated the minds of the colonists, who realised that their needs were not receiving the just attention of their rulers in the old land. And in particular the Churchmen, who continued to be the loyalists of America, had too good cause to complain that their just demands were persistently set aside out of a cowardly deference to the noisy protestations of their disloyal opponents. A truer perception of moral responsibility in earlier days; a more

ungrudging effort to give to the colonies the best influences which England could supply ; a more ready freedom of expansion allowed to the Church, would have increased the forces of loyalty and would probably have engendered such a feeling of mutual understanding and sympathy, that an obnoxious Act would never have been passed by a Legislature which was at pains to be in touch with the feelings of the colonists. But the crisis was precipitated by a long course of neglect and indifference to their needs ; America gained her independence ; the nation at home was shorn of the greater part of her first empire ; and an opportunity of untold possibilities of spiritual influence was removed from England and her Church.

(iii.) *India*. Perhaps the history of British rule in India affords the most striking illustration. For 100 years we had practically governed India, when the Mutiny broke out. If ever in history the sense of moral obligation should have impressed the conscience and shaped the policy of a people, it should have been in the dealings of England with her great Dependency. Englishmen should surely have regarded so mighty a heritage as a solemn trust. The nation owed it to India to bring to that distracted country, along with the blessings of peace and progress and just government, every possible facility for the spread of the gospel message which had enabled England to become great. For 100 years the responsible leaders hesitated to allow freedom of expansion to missionary enterprise. The cowardly policy was justified out of alleged consideration for the susceptibilities of the Hindus. And in the end so little sympathy had been engendered between rulers and subjects that a thoughtless act which seemed to outrage the most cherished superstition of these very Hindus, skilfully handled by unscrupulous agitators, was the means of kindling a flame which set all India in a blaze. And

in those days of horror almost the only natives in the mutinous districts who were found loyal to our rule were the scanty band of native Christians. Before the beginning of the siege of Agra the terrified Europeans were gathered together in the fort. Insurgent forces were closing in upon them on every side. No natives could be trusted. A body of converted Hindus—the fruits of the labours of the Rev. T. V. French, afterwards Bishop of Lahore—approached the gates and requested admission on the ground that being Christians they would inevitably be slaughtered by their heathen fellow-countrymen. The commandant not unnaturally demurred to the introduction of any natives at such a time. Mr. French was present, having taken refuge with other English residents in the fort. He came forward and claimed them as his converts. He offered to be responsible for their loyalty, and announced his intention, in case of their non-admission, to go out and join them, in order to die with them. His arguments prevailed. The natives were admitted, and did signal service fighting shoulder to shoulder with their rulers throughout the siege.*

It is impossible to estimate what might have been the influence upon the Indian crisis of forty years ago had England had behind her the record of a century of missionary effort. Certainly the forces of loyalty and order would have been immeasurably strengthened. Possibly the crisis might have been averted by a more widespread sympathy, which would have led to a better understanding between rulers and subjects. Does not the record go far to justify the claim put forward by an eminent authority on foreign missions that “the real preservers of India as a British possession are the men

* *Life of Bishop French*, vol. i. pp. 96–98. The absolute simplicity with which the story is told, and the evident desire to minimise an heroic action, cannot disguise the importance of the episode or the moral which it conveys.

who from the love of God and with no prospect of personal gain are labouring to evangelise it . . . they are rendering service which neither the statesman nor the soldier can supply . . . only in the conversion of India to Christianity lies the ground of our hope of long possessing it"?*

(iv.) *South Africa.* Once more we are at this moment face to face with a grave imperial problem. We are waging a war of a magnitude which requires a larger British force than has ever been put into the field in the whole course of our history. Without adopting any alarmist view it is beyond question that the existence of our empire in the province of South Africa has been for the moment seriously imperilled. But the gravest cause for anxiety arises not from the stubborn bravery or skilled marksmanship of our foes, but from the fact that two European races are fighting out a deadly struggle in the presence of an overwhelming number of surrounding savage peoples, who outnumber the combined forces of the contending nations. Everything at this moment depends upon the continued loyalty and order of the warlike Basutos and Zulus and Kaffirs. We are watching with keen anxiety and deep admiration the successful efforts of a handful of English civil servants and magistrates to restrain the old warlike instincts of these once formidable peoples. If once let loose we know that terrible bloodshed must ensue, and that a situation already difficult would quickly become, at least for the moment, desperate. But it may well be the case that some are ignoring at this moment of crisis the forces upon which our resident magistrates can most certainly rely to aid them in their work. In the diocese of St. John's, Kaffraria, there are thirty-five clergymen of our Church labouring principally among the heathen, and

* *Under His Banner*, by the Rev. Prebendary TUCKER, 7th ed. p. 60.

of these no less than fifteen are themselves native priests and deacons. Zululand has its network of Church missions, in which five English clergy and a strong force of native catechists are employed. Basutoland has eight English clergymen, some of whom have been working there for more than twenty years, who are also reinforced by a body of faithful native lay agents. Each of these mission stations* (and many more throughout South Africa) is a strong centre of loyal influence working for law and peace and order. If the native races at this moment remain loyal to our rule it will assuredly be in no small measure due to the influence of the Christian Church and to the zeal with which the gospel has been preached amongst them.

The empire, then, needs for its own welfare the Church's missions. For vigorous missionary enterprise operates as a potent force for maintaining the stability of the nation. Our empire is composed of absolutely diverse peoples spread over the five continents of the world. No natural bond of union exists which can cement these heterogeneous elements into one. The interests are often divergent. Peoples of different race will naturally be led by sentiment and patriotism towards those of the same stock. Only the inspiring force of religion, and the sound moral code which flows from it, and which provides the surest guarantee for good government, can weld into one great whole so composite a State. All alike can be made to learn that under the British flag—because it is the emblem of a Christian State—peace and safety, justice and security of life and property, freedom and opportunities of healthy development are assured to them.

* These districts are selected on account of the pre-eminently missionary character of the work, and their close proximity to the seat of war. The statistics of the other dioceses of South Africa only serve to strengthen the argument.

This will kindle the enthusiastic loyalty of all alike, from the patriotic settlers of Canada and Australia to the conservative Hindus and the savage aborigines of New Guinea.* But this can only be done by an empire which is Christian at heart, and eager to promote Christianity among its subjects.

And the Christian spirit which must be the determining factor of our imperial policy is equally necessary for the good government of an English colony and for the development of a savage race.

The emigrant to an English-speaking, self-governing colony has a right to expect to find there a reproduction of all that is best in English life, without some of the hampering conditions resulting from an overcrowded population and the consequent competition and struggle for a bare existence. In many cases he is doomed to grievous disappointment. He finds a community for whose spiritual needs at the outset no adequate provision has been made. Churches, it may be, are few and far between, and the ministrations of religion, for lack of clergy, are only occasionally brought within his reach. His children are too often subject to a system of educa-

* A striking episode marked the arrival of the first missionary of the Church in New Guinea. The Rev. A. A. Maclaren was at Port Moresby the guest of the Governor, who had promised to convey him in the Government s.s. to the district assigned to the Anglican Mission. An Italian adventurer arriving at Port Moresby displayed a fine collection of curios obtained from one of the villages from which the frightened inhabitants had been scared away by his revolver. The story reached the ears of the Governor, who, much to the chagrin of the enterprising traveller, demanded the immediate restitution of the stolen goods. In company with the missionary he at once proceeded to the village which had been robbed. The natives, in angry, warlike mood, threatened violence. At last they were induced to lay aside their spears, and to approach the shore, where they found their restored property spread out upon the beach. The flag flying at the masthead was pointed to as the emblem of security of property to all subjects of the Queen. The missionary who proposed to make his home with them had come to teach them the principles of conduct which inspired an English governor to "render to all their dues."

tion which has been rigidly secularised. Possibly the very name of Christ has been eliminated from the textbooks of the schools. He quickly realises that in the flowing tide of colonial life there are strong currents setting in the direction of laxity of morals and a deficient sense of moral responsibility on social and economic questions. He finds that the tendency of colonial legislation is in danger of imperilling the sanctity of the marriage bond. He finds himself in an environment of reckless and too often dishonest speculation, which aims only at the acquisition of wealth on whatever terms. He realises that industrial disputes and problems from which he fondly hoped to escape have reappeared in an accentuated form embittered by a spirit of unreasoning selfishness.

These tendencies are the obvious results of the spiritual apathy of the Church in the earliest days of colonial settlement. That body which could have dominated the life and moulded the character and guided the moral development of the young community has in the past abrogated its functions. No other agency has stepped in to occupy the vacant place. Christian principle has been eliminated from the educational system, and with it the only valid sanction for morality has disappeared. By insensible degrees the rapidly maturing nation has become a community secularist in fact, though not in name. Heroic efforts may be made to recover the lost ground, and with partial success; but the mischief has been done, and can never be wholly eradicated from the system of the body politic.

To the young community these tendencies, if unchecked, spell ruin; for they destroy the coherence and stability of social life by taking from it the spirit of mutual confidence and consideration, and the disastrous results make themselves quickly felt at home. One illustration may suffice. Any suspicion of economic insecurity reacts at

once upon the English Stock Exchange. It is certainly not an exalted or noble plea to urge; but considerations of worldly wisdom might well suggest to the investor in colonial securities that on economic grounds—if the moral appeal appear to lack persuasive power—he would be well advised to increase the liberality of his offerings in furtherance of the spiritual work of the Church in the region from which his wealth is drawn.

But if the Church's work is so necessary a factor in the healthy development of a colonial people, it is also the only adequate support to the nation in its efforts to fulfil that part of its imperial mission which consists in the uplifting and civilising, and in the preservation of subject races. How often we have failed egregiously even to seriously attempt this noblest of the tasks entrusted to us! Whole tribes and peoples have been exterminated by deeds of violence and by diseases due to the coming of the white man. The old Red Indians of Newfoundland have disappeared.* The original occupants of Tasmania have utterly perished. Even the aboriginal tribes of Australia are a dying race. It is often alleged that this is the necessary result of the contact of civilisation with barbarous peoples. It would be much more true to say that it is the natural result of suffering these savage races to be infected by all the worst European vices before they have had the opportunity of learning the restraints and the ennobling influences of the Christian faith. Too often drunkenness and profligacy have been the first lessons taught by the white man, and the messenger of the gospel has had to begin by striving to eradicate the evils already

* "The Beothuks or Red Indians of Newfoundland are now entirely extinct. The last survivor is said to have died in 1829. . . . The history of the extermination of this people by the whites is a dark page in the annals of Newfoundland." (Dr. A. F. CHAMBERLAIN, in *Handbook of Canada*, published for British Association Meeting in 1897. See p. 109.)

produced by his own fellow-countrymen. It is to this reckless corruption that the rapid extinction of the weaker native races has been largely due. It is this which has infinitely increased the difficulty of the task of those who have sought to bring to them the elevating influence of the Christian Church. The power of the gospel to uplift and to preserve savage races, and to enable them to survive the influence of civilisation, has been abundantly proved in all parts of the empire, especially where the Government has taken careful steps to shield them from corrupting influences. The Red Indians of Canada,* the Maoris of New Zealand,† and many of the African peoples‡ are conspicuous illustrations of its beneficent work. As to the importance of the service rendered by the mis-

* The former rapid decrease in numbers of the Red Indians appears to have been now arrested. The latest census returns (1897-8) show a distinct increase in the numbers of the aboriginal tribes, which is general throughout the Dominion. The numbers were 100,093, as against 99,364 for the preceding year. Of these no fewer than 70,468 were Christians, 15,615 were pagans, 14,010 of unknown religion. In his prefatory Report the Deputy Superintendent-General makes the following striking assertion: "No single offence of any very serious gravity committed within the year has been brought home to any Treaty Indian, at any rate in so far as can be recalled at the moment." (See *Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs (Dominion of Canada)*, 1898, pp. xviii., xxv., and 429.) There are at least eleven Red Indian clergymen working in the dioceses of Canada. The ability of the Red Man to take full advantage of the educational facilities offered by civilisation is well illustrated by the eminent position attained by Oronhyatekha, M.D., who is supreme executive officer of the I.O.F., and one of the greatest authorities on questions of life insurance.

† The last three census returns give the numbers of the Maori population as follows: in 1886, 41,969; 1891, 41,993; 1896, 39,854. An epidemic is alleged to have reduced the numbers before the last census. The Maori population is generally regarded as stationary. (See *Official Year Book of New Zealand*, 1899, p. 141.) The Maoris are now mainly Christian, though belonging to many sects. Four Maoris have seats in the Legislative Assembly. Two are members of the Legislative Council. In the last General Election for Parliament 13,000 Maoris recorded their votes. There are no less than 37 Maori clergymen working in three of the New Zealand dioceses.

‡ "So much may certainly be said, that the Gospel and the mission schools are at present the most truly civilising influences at work upon the natives, and that upon these influences more than on any other agency does the progress of the coloured races depend." (BRYCE, *Impressions of S. Africa*, 3rd ed. 378.)

sionary in the fulfilment of this difficult part of our imperial responsibility, notable testimony has been borne by many eminent servants of the Crown. One such may well be quoted. It is the verdict of Sir William Macgregor, who, to the untold gain of the dependency, was chosen as the first administrator of British New Guinea, one of the newest and certainly one of the most savage of all our possessions. At the close of his work on British New Guinea, published in 1897, he writes :—

“It has been a matter of much surprise to me that I have very frequently been asked whether missions to aboriginal peoples do any good. . . . Of the work of conversion, of the spiritual results obtained in New Guinea, it would be unedifying and impertinent to speak here, but as to how mission work affects native society and the State, that we may freely discuss.

“It is to be feared that many of us are apt to forget that the missionary is constituted like other men, and that he is therefore as liable to err as another. Were it not so, how could he be in sympathy with the rest of mankind? They are as other men are, and therefore there are good and less good missionaries and teachers. But as a class they are the most self-denying men, and lead the best lives of any category of men of whom I have any knowledge. I cannot think of one that ever enriched himself. Thousands and thousands of travellers have experienced their ever-open hospitality, often without knowing that their hosts had to reduce their own fare in order to decently entertain the stranger. As an example of regular and moral life, the presence of a missionary would be valuable if he never taught anything else.”

Concerning the educational work of missions, he continues :—

“Missionaries, therefore, are performing, without cost to the State, one of its great functions, a labour which of itself is more than enough to justify their presence. It is perfectly true that tribes can be reconciled, that murders can be stamped out, that thefts can be controlled by the Government, and trade can be established where there are no mission stations; and it is also

the case that mission teaching cannot effectually put down intertribal fights, murder, and theft any more than the Church can make the policeman unnecessary here; but mission influence has sometimes prevented intertribal war, and has reduced the frequency of murder, and in all cases it tends to make the work of the magistrate and policeman lighter. Peace is easier to establish, and when established is easier to maintain in a mission district than elsewhere. Tribes near a mission station, as a rule fall more readily into the ways of the white man than others. Through the missionaries as a class the natives learn to entertain a higher opinion of and greater respect for the white man than would otherwise be the case. Looking, as administrator, at the presence and work of the missionaries, the above is my answer to the question as to whether they are useful or not. It practically amounts to this, that they are indispensable. It is not known to me that any officer that was responsible for the well-being and development of a primitive race ever entertained a different opinion."*

Enough has now been said as to the importance to the State of encouraging the free development of missionary enterprise. At home and abroad, among English-speaking colonists and highly cultured heathen, as well as among savage races, it is a source of strength to the empire, and the surest guarantee of progress and stability.

V.

But if this expansive spirit is of essential importance to the welfare of the State, it is still more obvious that the whole vigour of the Church's life and the realisation of its ideal depends upon it. Quite apart from the clear and direct command laid upon the Christian Society to go forth to the evangelisation of the world, and never to rest in its career of progress until the gospel has been preached to every creature,

* *British New Guinea: Country and People*, by Sir WILLIAM MACGREGOR, pp. 91, 92. John Murray, 1897.

it is quite evident from the New Testament that the attainment of the ideal of the Church is essentially dependent upon the fullest realisation of its Catholic character. As Christians, we believe that in the Divine Person of "the Son of Man" we see the perfect representation of the sum total of human excellence—all the highest possibilities of humanity perfectly realised. It is the function of the Christian Church to strive after the perfect imitation of its divine Founder. No individual man, however holy, can possibly do more than faintly attempt to copy some one side of that many-sided life. Only in the corporate life of the whole "kingdom"—in the fully realised anticipation of a city of God, into which "they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations"*—can the imitation of Christ become possible. It is this idea which is prominent in the mind of the great missionary apostle when he looks forward to and thus describes the goal of the Church's efforts: "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ . . . from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love."† Here is one of the suggestive thoughts to quicken missionary zeal. The accomplishment of the purpose of the Church depends upon its free and world-wide expansion. The body of Christ can only attain to the conception implied in "the full-grown man," when the genius of every race is fully represented. Every colonial or missionary Church has its own special contribution to make to the great life of the whole to enable the realisation of "the fulness of Christ." The life of the Church is enriched and

* Rev. xxi. 26.

† Eph. iv. 13, 16.

strengthened as each race or country contributes its peculiar excellence to the edification of the whole. The application of this great foundation principle of missionary enterprise has very direct and important bearing upon the spiritual responsibilities devolving upon the Church of a world-wide empire. The extent of the imperial responsibilities of Christian England is the measure of the contribution which Anglicanism may make towards the realisation of the Church ideal. Each failure to occupy for Christ the lands thrown open by national expansion involves the impoverishment of the Church's life for lack of some particular expression of the Christian character. And just as the State learns from its own dependencies and by the process of experience gained in ruling, grows to the imperial idea and to the apprehension of the resulting responsibilities; so the Church in the old land learns from the experience of the daughter Churches, and, in learning, attains to a wider Catholicity and a fuller life. Several illustrations of the operation of this principle will readily suggest themselves. The deliberative functions of the Church until recently were practically in abeyance. Conferences and congresses were almost unknown. Their rapid extension has been largely due to Colonial initiative. And the most important of all ecclesiastical deliberative assemblies, the Pan-Anglican Conference, is the outcome of a direct appeal from the daughter Church in Canada."*

The legislative functions of the Church at home are somewhat obscured by the accident of her close connection with the State; but the object lessons supplied during the last sixty years by synodical action, diocesan and provincial, in the several Colonial Churches, enabled the Church of Ireland to meet the crisis of disestablishment, and are constantly educating the minds of English Churchmen

* See *Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences*, by the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

and qualifying them to use such wider powers of self-government as may in the future be obtained or be thrust upon them. The development of a more adaptive spirit to meet the complex problems presented by modern social needs is constantly being stimulated by the experiments proved to be serviceable in other lands. For example, the Brotherhood of S. Andrew—a society of American origin—has suggested to us at home the importance of an association of earnest laymen pledged to constant personal effort for the extension of Christ's kingdom among men.

It would not be difficult still to add to the list of direct benefits conferred upon the home Church by the daughter communities, resulting from the infinitely varied experience gained under the widely different conditions of colonial and missionary work.

But over and above all these, the expansive movements by which the gospel is carried into other lands are a direct necessity to the Christian Society as affording the required outlet and direction for that spiritual energy which is the essential condition of healthy Church life.

The Christian spirit has the characteristic of restless eagerness, "like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal." There must be scope for active development and constant work. Every great wave of spiritual feeling, every fresh stirring of spiritual life places a new power at the disposal of the Church to use for the furtherance of the gospel. And if the legitimate direction of this quickened force along the line of missionary enterprise be overlooked, there is danger that the new wine will burst the old wine-skins and spend itself in less constructive efforts. The past half-century has witnessed a movement of more far-reaching influence in the life of the national Church than any which has taken place since the Reformation. The Anglican revival has stirred the whole life of the Church, not merely of one party.

It has spread to the remotest corners of the land and throughout the whole communion ; it has quickened every department of Church life. Churches have been built and restored ; bishoprics have been endowed ; provision has been made for the more effectual training of the clergy ; dignity and reverence have been restored in the public worship of the Church ; schools have been multiplied, and innumerable organisations have sprung into being for the furtherance of Church work and for the correction of moral and social evils. And there has been a correspondingly notable development of missionary activity to which attention has already been called. And if the fruits of the movement are to prove themselves of permanent power and utility, the progressive work will still be carried forward ; fresh zeal and activity in furtherance of the gospel will continually be generated ; development there will certainly continue to be, but its permanent value to the Church depends upon its constructive character. So far as the restatement of the old time-honoured principles, drawn from the New Testament, progressively interpreted in the light of the growing knowledge and experience of successive generations, promotes a more careful study of their application to the moral and social problems of modern life ; so far as it kindles a wider and more generous enthusiasm for aggressive missionary work ; so far the results must be of permanent value to the Church. Unhappily there are not wanting signs that in certain quarters the course of development is in danger of setting in another direction. The existence of the so-called "crisis in the Church," and the prominent place which it is occupying in men's minds, proclaims the fact that no inconsiderable part of this spiritual force, which might be devoted to constructive work, is setting along the line of mere ritual extravagance. If Churchmen generally could become imbued with a more passionate zeal for

missionary enterprise, ample scope would there be found for all their energies, and there would be left but little room for the barren discussion of matters in themselves comparatively trivial, so long as a world is waiting to be won for Christ. In the fuller development of missionary zeal is surely to be sought the most effectual remedy for the unhappy crisis which at the moment imperils the national character of the Church of England, and threatens to impair its power to become the most effective instrument for the conversion of the world. It is hardly too much to say that upon its strenuous efforts to become the Church of the empire depends the continuance of its title as the National Church.

VI.

It only remains to draw attention to some of the special conditions which accentuate the difficulty of the problem, and which Churchmen will do well to face and to recognise as having a determining influence on the position of the Church in the empire.

(i.) *Supply of Clergy.* First of all there faces us the initial question of the vast army of living agents required for the effective prosecution of the world-wide task, and the apparently insuperable difficulty of finding any adequate sources of supply. What are the facts with regard to the supply of ordination candidates at home? While year by year the enormous populations of our rapidly growing cities are making ever greater calls for an increasing force of clergy to cope with the constantly expanding claims, the actual number of men who are offering for the ministry of the Church has been showing alarming signs of steady diminution.* People are beginning seriously to

* The number of candidates ordained to the diaconate during the five years beginning 1883 was 3,884—an average of 777 per annum. The corresponding

seek for an intelligible explanation of the phenomenon, and to ask where the supply of clergy to meet the home needs of the Church is to be sought for in the future. The spread of sceptical opinions in the Universities, the insecurity of clerical incomes, and various other causes are alleged to account for the failure. Comparatively few persons seem to recognise it as an illustration of the operation of the far-reaching principle suggested in the words of the writer of the Proverbs: "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth; there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." The Incumbent of an immense and increasing suburban parish,* commenting upon the growing difficulty of securing an adequate clerical staff, recently wrote: "It is all very well to organise a council for service abroad; it will very soon become necessary to start a short-service system in the colonies to induce colonial clergy to come over and help us to staff our parishes at home." The words were uttered in jest, but they contain the suggestion of a splendid possibility. What grander result could there possibly be of the loyal efforts of the Church to fulfil her spiritual responsibility to the empire than this, that possibly in days to come so zealous a spirit might be implanted in the Colonial Churches that from their own excess of native clergy men might be spared to come and take their places in the ranks of the home ministry in order to share in the great work of recovering to the faith the teeming thousands of our congested towns? But without indulging in so distant an anticipation, our contention as to the best way to remedy the deficiency of candidates for ordination is briefly to this effect. Im-

aggregate for the five years beginning 1894 was 3,398—an average of 679 per annum, showing a decrease of nearly 100 per annum, or $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (see *Official Year-Book of the Church*, 1899, p. 534).

* Rev. H. W. E. Molony, Vicar of Ilford.

perialise the idea of the Church and her mission, and the supply of candidates for Holy Orders will steadily increase. The impulse given to missionary enterprise will operate in several directions. In the first place a broader outlook will be presented to those who might be led to desire ordination. Many men who would fail to be attracted by the homely duties of an English parish priest will be inspired with a wider view of the ministerial office as they realise the magnificent opportunities for the exercise of all possible gifts and talents in the constructive work of building up our Colonial Churches. The actual physical hardships and the scope for the exercise of courage and endurance will attract some. Others will be fascinated by the demand for organising powers and business capacity which comes from those new lands, where Church life needs to be built up from the very beginning on firmly laid foundations. Others, again, will be won by the imperial idea and by the growing sense of a patriotic duty, a service due to England to enable her to fulfil her high vocation. England is calling for volunteers to-day. The welfare of the empire depends upon the ready response of her sons. Those who realise this aspect of missionary work will not be backward in offering themselves for this noble service.

But again, a more generous scattering of the best and noblest of her sons will react upon the life of the Church in another direction. The colonists will ultimately be able to supply their own native ministry. And we must look to the infectious enthusiasm inspired by the best men from the old country as the surest means for bringing about that wished-for result. As our men go out more freely and more widely there will be an increasing number of the best colonial boys fired by their zeal to offer themselves for the service of the Church. They will in many cases come home to draw from the old English

Universities the inspiration for their life's work; these in turn will become more imperial in their influence, and the to-and-fro movement in Church life between England and the Colonies will tend to become freer and fuller. A closer sympathy with colonial needs based upon a truer appreciation of the problems to be faced will issue in the quickening of the missionary spirit which lies at the very root of the pastoral vocation. And this will tend in turn to develop the supply of candidates for ordination.

Meanwhile there are practical ways in which the supply of clergy for service abroad may be extended. Already more than 4,500 of the junior clergy of England are banded together in associations and unions connected with the great missionary societies for the avowed purpose of promoting missionary enterprise.* And the formation of a central council for service abroad, nominated by the two archbishops, sanctioned by the whole bench of English bishops, and warmly welcomed by the bishops abroad, provides a recognised system of volunteering for foreign service wherever, in the judgment of those best qualified to decide, the need of men is most acute. It remains for the bishops to promote the formation of these missionary unions amongst the clergy, and to encourage the members to enrol themselves as volunteers for service abroad.

Nor must we neglect the opportunity afforded by the more perfectly graduated steps of the educational ladder for a freer admission of young men drawn from the trading and artizan classes to the ranks of the ministry. By means of the increased facilities offered through County Council scholarships the advantages of a university education are

* The Junior Clergy Missionary Associations in connection with S.P.G., in May, 1899, numbered sixty-one branches, with a total membership of 3,237. The branches of the Younger Clergy Unions, in connection with C.M.S., numbered at the same date twenty-four, with a membership of 1,200.

brought within the reach of the most promising boys in the elementary and secondary schools of the country. Many of them have the ministerial vocation, and are well fitted to render excellent service both at home and abroad, but they are often deterred by the expenses incidental to university training. It behoves the Church to make provision to correspond with the educational facilities offered, and to provide studentships available for the assistance of those who gain university scholarships and who are anxious to offer themselves for ordination.

And again, in our younger colonies, where educational machinery is still incomplete, many promising candidates for Holy Orders are continually being lost owing to the obstacles which seem to bar the way to their training.* It is highly desirable that sufficient funds should be placed at the disposal of colonial dioceses to enable such promising students to come home in order to graduate at an English University. Many of them would probably desire to serve their first curacy in an English parish, to the great advantage of the Home Church.

And finally, it must be remembered that clergymen are not the only, and not always the most effective, missionary agents. There is great need of a freer development of organisations for the supply of lay agents for the colonial and missionary Churches. Why are sisters and deaconesses so hard to obtain for colonial work? Why is there a dearth of elementary school teachers willing to volunteer for service in such colonies as the West Indies, where the mission schools receive Government aid, and where

* Bishop Webbe, formerly of Grahamstown, in a paper written in 1895 on "Colonial Church Expansion" (in S. Africa), says: "The candidates for our colonial ministry are still few and far between. This is chiefly owing to the necessity of earning a livelihood until the canonical age of twenty-three. We have only one scholarship in the division [the eastern division of Cape Colony] of £40 a year to help a student preparing for Holy Orders. And there is as yet no theological college in the Province."

Christian teachers can mould the character of the native Church of a future generation? Why has so little progress been made in the development of industrial missions amongst the savage races of the empire? In the missionary diocese of New Guinea an appeal is at this moment being made for twenty-five more missionary agents, of whom fifteen are required as artizans to train the people in trades and manual work. Only by emphasising the imperial responsibilities of the Church, and the national call for patriotic service, will the Church be enabled to supply these multitudinous needs.

(ii.) *Our Unhappy Divisions.* But another factor in the situation requires to be frankly and seriously considered. Modern Anglicanism is far from being co-extensive with English Christianity. Leaving out of consideration the English-speaking Roman Catholics, there are outside of the Church a number of vigorous and active Protestant Bodies. Their strength and influence has been fostered and developed by the apathy of Churchmen in past days. They are, generally speaking, characterised by earnest and devoted work in the mission field. They have been instrumental in effecting the conversion to Christianity of a far larger number of heathen than those who have received the gospel at the hands of agents of the Anglican Church. Their position to-day at home and abroad bids fair to ensure the future prevalence of a type of English Christianity quite other than that which is derived from the Church of England. No review of the position of the Church in the empire could fairly be considered as a complete presentment of the facts which failed to take account of the strenuous efforts made by other denominations. To obtain a complete survey of the facts is naturally almost impossible. The field is too wide; statistics are difficult to obtain, and are sometimes untrustworthy or misleading. But a few leading facts are

worthy of note, and illustrate the heavy price which the Church has to pay to-day for her indifference to the needs of the American colonies in bygone days. Churchmen at home contribute approximately £1,000,000 a year in support of missionary enterprise.* The Protestant denominations at home contribute rather more than £500,000 for the same object. So far the efforts made by the Church, inadequate as they are, maintain a due pre-eminence. But when the contributions of American Christians are thrown into the balance the scale is immediately turned. The report presented to the General Convention of the American Church in 1898 showed that the amount subscribed by American Churchmen for missionary purposes during the preceding three years exceeded £340,000, giving an approximate average contribution of £113,000 per annum. During the same year 1898 the contributions of the Methodist and also of the Presbyterian societies of America are stated to have exceeded £250,000, and the aggregate offerings of American and Canadian Protestant denominations are stated to have exceeded £1,183,000.† Supposing that these figures fairly represent the facts, they appear to indicate that the entire sum annually spent by the Anglican Church in furtherance of missionary enterprise

* *Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, 1899, p. xxv., cf. explanation on p. xxvi.

† The statistics referring to Church contributions are taken from the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, and from a summarised report of the statistics laid before the General Convention of the American Church in 1898. The statistics of Nonconformist contributions are derived from an American magazine, *The Missionary Review of the World* (Funk and Wagnall). It must, in fairness, be added that the statistics there set forth, in so far as they relate to the Church, are so misleading as to raise the natural presumption that there may also be considerable inaccuracy on the other side. This, however, cannot materially affect the main contention that the total aggregate support rendered by other denominations to missionary enterprise largely exceeds in amount the contributions of the Church.

falls short of the offerings made by all other English-speaking and Reformed Christian bodies by not less than £500,000. Supposing the same ratio to be consistently maintained, what is likely to be the dominant tone of English Christianity at the close of the twentieth century?

Undoubtedly in many parts of the mission field the Protestant bodies have far outstripped the National Church, largely as the result of the activity of American missionary societies. Thus in India the native Christians in communion with the Church were reported in 1891 to number 237,468, while those connected with other Reformed Churches were 389,109.* Or, to take another particular instance, in Melanesia, New Guinea, and the South Seas the Church expends an annual sum of £13,000, and claims 15,000 native converts. Other missionary societies expend £37,000, and claim 186,800 adherents. Churchmen might well feel disheartened at such startling figures, but for some encouraging considerations. The Church has generally been late in the field of missionary enterprise; but once the missionary spirit has been thoroughly roused the wonderful progress made may well give cause for thankfulness. Little more than a century ago America received her first bishop. To-day the communicants of the American Church number 680,000, and at two successive General Conventions of the Church—held triennially—an increase of ten per cent. in the number has been reported.† The Indian Church has had the benefit

* According to the census of 1891 the population of India was 287,223,431. The total number of Christians was 2,284,380, or '80 per cent. Omitting from consideration 168,000 Europeans, the native and Eurasian Christians numbered 2,116,380. Of these about 30 per cent., 626,577, belonged to some denomination of reformed Christians, of whom the Church of England claimed 237,468, or nearly 38 per cent. (See Census 1891, General Report, pp. 169 and foll.)

† See *Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, p. 374; cf. *The Church in America*, chap. xxii. on "Growth and Prospects." In 1844 the communicants numbered 60,000 out of a population in the United States

of episcopal supervision only since 1814. But already the clergy of the ten dioceses number 845, and of these no less than 300 are native pastors.

Such an inspiring record of progress may well nerve us for more untiring efforts, and may justify the belief that the dry bones have been effectually stirred, and that the results which we see to-day are but the earnest of the "exceeding great army" which will one day stand up upon its feet to claim the world for Christ. And in view of the existing facts, what tremendous importance attaches to every well-considered effort made in the cause of home reunion! What splendid results might be achieved by any providential agreement which, without sacrifice of essential principle, might obtain for the Church a recognition of her rightful place as the rallying centre for the scattered forces of English Christianity! Our unhappy divisions grievously complicate the problem before us, but neither hopelessly nor, as we venture to think, finally.

(iii.) *Party strife.* There is a further ground for serious anxiety which needs to be mentioned. There are abundant tokens that internal dissensions, which tend to become acute, may operate no less than external division in the direction of checking the expansive power of the Church. The present "crisis" too clearly indicates an attempt to substitute the shibboleths and tenets of a party for the breadth of teaching which has characterised the Reformed Church of England since the sixteenth century. If the Church is to cover the field

of America of 18,000,000, *i.e.* 1 : 300 ; in 1894 the communicants numbered 600,000 out of a population of 65,000,000, *i.e.* 1 : 108. "Should the present rate of gain upon the population be accelerated during the next few years as it has been during the latter half of the present century, it will not be long ere the Church will be everywhere recognised as indeed the American Church."

marked out for it by the extent of our imperial responsibilities; if spiritual expansion is to keep pace with the growth of empire; it is essential that a thoroughly representative—not an exclusive—type of Anglican theology and Anglican worship should dominate the forward movement. To accentuate and embitter party differences must often be prejudicial to Church progress at home. It will be a fatal blow to steady expansion abroad. Breadth and inclusiveness and the power of ready adaptation to modern needs must be the characteristics of a Church which has set before it the task of moulding the spiritual destinies of a world-wide empire. Colonial life and character can be profoundly impressed by strong constructive Church teaching. No other religious body can wield so powerful an influence. The special genius of the colonies demands an inspiration of a special kind, which the Church is peculiarly qualified to give. Combining the strong force of Catholic tradition and the authority of an apostolic mission with the freedom and elasticity and spirit of self-reliance drawn from the Reformation, it is especially adapted to impress the Christian character upon the conservative radicalism of colonial life. But colonials would be supremely impatient of any attempt to exaggerate the importance of liturgical or ritual detail, or of such a presentment of Christian doctrine as would destroy the sense of proportion by an undue prominence given to one aspect of gospel teaching. Party lines are strongly to be deprecated, and especially in the mission field. To commit the guidance and direction of missionary enterprise to the whole bench of bishops as the recognised leaders of the Church is an ideal already realised in the Colonial Churches to which we in England should endeavour to approximate.

And finally, for the solution of the problem which lies

before us, for the accomplishment of the mighty task committed to us, for the development and maintenance of the strenuous efforts which are required of us, there must be enkindled a universal spirit of enthusiasm for Church extension. The country needs to be organised from end to end. Every parish should have its own missionary association. Every parish should strive to have at least one representative labouring in the mission field. The bicentenary of our oldest missionary society—which for two centuries has made it its first endeavour to follow the British flag and to make the Church of the nation the gospeller of the empire—affords a splendid opportunity for quickened zeal and redoubled efforts. The record of the next two years will go far to show how far Churchmen are prepared to emulate the spirit of sacrifice which animates the empire at a moment of crisis when the call goes forth for an army of volunteers for active service. The extent of the response made by Churchmen to the call will be the measure of our ability to claim for our National Church the title of the Church of the British Empire.

XIII.

The Anglican Spirit in Literature

By H. C. BEECHING, M.A.

MANY people must have felt that there is about the best religious writings of the Church of England a tone and temper proper to it, and distinguishable from those of other communions. Whether this temper can be precisely described as well as distinguished, whether in any attempted analysis so volatile a spirit would not escape, is another matter. The attempt at least to indicate it seems worth making, because at the present day there prevails in some quarters a disposition to deny to our Church any peculiar characteristics of its own, other than a certain cold formalism, due to its connection with the State; which Erastian coldness it is considered to be the duty of loyal Churchmen to qualify by an infusion from the literature and ritual of warmer climes. Against such ill-instructed loyalty the following pages may serve as a protest. Their aim is to call attention, in the literature of the great period when our Church started upon her independent career, to the reasonable faith, the wide intellectual sympathy, the reserved enthusiasm, the reverent piety, which inspire those writings; qualities which were no merely accidental reaction against Romanism on the

one hand and Puritanism on the other, though they define themselves constantly by reference to those, but an ideal that was framed by a study of Scripture and the primitive Church ; and reflected as it was in the dignified simplicity of the reformed ritual, was found capable of satisfying the instinct alike for conduct, belief, and worship of the best Englishmen in that generation.

It was remarked many years ago by a writer in *Tracts for the Times*, that our English Prayer-book was pitched in a much more sober key than the Latin services from which it was compiled ; and he hazarded the opinion that this was a providential disposition to adapt the Prayer-book to the days of the Anglican revival, when a graver and more penitential spirit was abroad in the churches. A simpler suggestion would be that at all times when the spirit of a Church is deeply stirred or comes to itself after a period of slumber, its mood is grave, and requires a serious expression ; because, though "joy in the Lord" is beyond doubt the true expression of a Christian's perfected faith, there is a joy springing from much nearer the surface which may have to be sacrificed for the sake of what lies deeper. Selden tells us in the *Table Talk*, "There never was a merry world since the parson left conjuring" ; and it is not difficult to imagine how life, for all but the best spirits, might pass without anxiety if the only chance of things going wrong in the next world was a sudden death which would deprive the Churchman of the effectual ministrations of his priest *in articulo mortis*. The English race in the "ages of faith" was in its childhood, and it is natural to childhood to be merry and unconcerned. Writing on St. Nicholas's day, I am reminded of that curious business, so incredible to us now, of the boy-bishop, which gave a note of gaiety, almost of farce, to what we now account the solemn season of Advent. The picturesque mummary must have served in its day some useful purpose,

so far as the boys were concerned, or Colet would not have approved it in his statutes for St. Paul's School,* but its popularity clearly indicates the childish gaiety of the pre-Reformation religious spirit, just as the popularity of St. Nicholas himself, proved by the number of churches dedicated to him, shows the childish appetite for marvel. The temper of mind which the Oxford Movement in our own century laboured to correct and deepen, while it had not the excuse of childishness, was as superficially at peace with itself. It had narrowed down religion to respectability, qualified by a formal assent to the doctrine of the Atonement and a regular hearing of sermons upon it; so that religion had become, in a different sense, a matter of the parson's conjuring, and the lay people could afford to have easy minds. It will be understood, then, why one recognisable note of Anglicanism, whether of the seventeenth or the nineteenth century, is its seriousness. It is the note of times when it has been seen that religion lays its claim upon the whole life, and is not a matter that can satisfactorily be deputed to a factor, whether priest or preacher.

This note of gravity, however, was common to all parties alike in the religious movement of the Reformation. The peculiar distinction of Anglicanism lay in three points. The first was that the English Church deepened its seriousness into devotion. The natural outcome of years of religious controversy is the decay of reverence and godly fear. When the deepest mysteries of religion are debated at every street corner, however serious the intention, the result must be that the object of such ceaseless speculation ceases to be an object of worship. From our

* "All these chyldren shall every Chyldermasse day come to paulis church and here the Chylde Bisshoppis sermon and after be at the hye masse, and eche of them to offer a jd to the childe bisshopp." The boy-bishop was abolished by Henry VIII., restored by Queen Mary, and finally abolished by Elizabeth.

recent experience in England of the disastrous effect that a polemical handling of sacred subjects has upon the spirit of religion, we are able to sympathise more keenly with the endeavour of Bishop Andrewes and those who followed him to emphasise worship as being the first duty of a Churchman, and to ensure that the public services of the Church should be orderly and befitting.

In the second place, the seriousness of Anglicanism took the form of a patient investigation into the creed and ritual of the primitive Church. All that common sense and the light of nature could do in exposing the corruptions and abuses of the Roman system had already been done. It was not possible, without going back to antiquity, to distinguish what in the Roman creed was Catholic from what was merely mediæval or modern. Accordingly, while the Puritan was content to oppose the *ipse dixit* of Calvin to the definitions of the Council of Trent, English Churchmen set to work to study the Fathers. The effect of this new learning may be seen by the most cursory glance at any catena of Anglican authorities on points of doctrine. Much of their effort is devoted to showing that the passages quoted from time immemorial in favour of Roman doctrines had, in their original context, no such bearing. In this way the appeal to antiquity, as against the dogmas of both Rome and Geneva, became part of the recognised apologetic of the Church of England. This care for primitive authority co-operated with the care for worship in reinspiring in the minds of Churchmen the spirit of reverence. The state of mind in religious matters of the ordinary Englishman of the upper class at the beginning of the seventeenth century was apt to be one of aggressive independence, as of a man who had freed his neck from an intolerable yoke, and was in no mood to bend it beneath any other. It was the part of the English Church to teach him, first, that

there is a service which is perfect freedom, and then that there is no slavery in loyal submission to a Church which makes its rule of faith only what has been received from primitive times, and can be defended out of Scripture.

A third distinction of Anglicanism lay in the fact that it did not, in its new devotional spirit, lose the reasonable and practical mind which is a characteristic endowment of Englishmen. This was shown in several ways. For example, it refused to become bigoted and partisan. It endeavoured, as long as possible, to find terms of communion with Rome and with the Presbyterians. Again, in its definitions, it preserved a sense of proportion, making an effort to "rightly divide the word of truth"; distinguishing what was of faith, and so of absolute consequence, such as an article of the Apostles' Creed, from what was only secondary, such as a particular theory of the Eucharist; whereas both Rome and Geneva were as sensitive at the extreme verge of their spider's web as they were at the centre, and as zealous in anathematising.* In general, we may say that Anglicanism kept its eyes upon the real facts of life. The stamp of the broad English temper lies upon the first document that belongs to the English as a national Church after its separation from Rome—that Litany, unequalled in any other communion, which we owe to the liturgical genius and wide human sympathies of Archbishop Cranmer. Anxious as Cranmer always showed himself to ask counsel of foreign reformers, he was yet every bit as anxious to use the treasures of past ages; and he found his way among ancient types and modern suggestions with a

* Mr. Ottley, in his excellent sketch of Bishop Andrewes (*Leaders of Religion* series), has some very good remarks on this point (pp. 194-6). Mr. Hutton, in his no less excellent sketch of Archbishop Laud (in the same series), quotes some admirable passages from Laud, indicating his breadth and tolerance (pp. 151-2). See also a passage from Donne, quoted below, p. 415.

fine skill and courage and instinct for reality which has made his Litany and the Prayer-book in which it was presently included a book dear to the hearts of educated Englishmen. But the Roman reaction under Mary, with its pitiful Smithfield fires, which lost none of their lurid horror in the dramatic pages of Foxe, inevitably drove a large body of the simpler sort into the arms of those Reformers, inspired from the Continent, who advocated a total surrender of every form, or rite, or ceremony that had ever had upon it the mark of anti-Christian Rome; and the appeal for greater simplicity was rendered a hundredfold stronger by the new popular reading of the Bible, especially in the Genevan version with comments in the sense of Calvin. The question arose in every market-place, Where in the New Testament is there any mention of the cross in baptism, or of kneeling at the Lord's Supper? Where is there any mention of prelatical bishops? Where of copes, or of surplices? The question of dress was canvassed with special zeal. Why should our ministers don this "idolatrous gear"? And the more the Queen, in her headstrong Tudor way, pressed for uniformity on the lines of the Prayer-book, the more did the obstinate English spirit of the middle-class traders labour, by open defiance and secret conspiracy, to bring in the new Presbyterian discipline; being abetted in their opposition by the great Lords, who saw in the subversion of the English Church an opportunity for plunder that would have eclipsed even the golden age of the dissolution of the monasteries. The new constitution seemed so simple and claimed to be so scriptural, and the view of it, seen in the distance at Geneva, shone with such New Jerusalem glories, that there is little wonder it should have enchanted the imagination of the uneducated, especially as the zeal of its preachers contrasted only too manifestly with the apathy and ignorance of so many of the clergy,

ordained in somewhat wholesale fashion to fill up the gaps made by the wholesale ejections that followed the death of Mary. "Now I pray thee," says a character in Spenser's *Shepheards Calender*—

"Now I pray thee let me thy tale borrow
For our Sir John to say to-morrow
At the kirk when it is holiday ;
For well he means, but little can say."

But the English Church was saved to do its peculiar work by the characteristic caution of its best spirits, who were content to repair or even reconstruct the city that already existed and refused to pull it down in exchange for one yet to build. Those combats in the pulpit of the Temple Church between the Master and the Reader, of which Walton tells us, really represent the typical English mind, with its innate conservatism and respect for tradition, in conflict with the heady enthusiasm of the travelled young man who has fallen in love with continental novelties. While, however, foreign fashions in dress might be ridiculed, foreign fashions in religion which posed as the absolute truth were not to be so lightly dismissed. The Temple strife long hung doubtful, and the Master, it is said, was overmatched in pulpit skill by the Reader. But if Hooker could not preach to effect, he could write as none before him, and few since; and retiring into the country he produced his book of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*—a work that, if Cranmer's Litany must rank as the first literary monument of Anglicanism, is as certainly the second, and only second to it in influence; for while the former breathes, and by breathing diffuses, the spirit of reasonable and earnest devotion that we claim as our Church's peculiar heritage, the other, for the first time, put into words, and perhaps it would be true to say into thought, the very principles upon which the English Church rests. That the English Church had any genuine

vitality of its own seemed to the Presbyterian theorists hardly credible. They looked upon it as a dying stock that had been lopped of its main branches in preparation for the final work of the axe at its root; and therefore the attempt to prove that what had been cut away was really parasitical, and that what remained held within itself a vital principle, which could throw out branches and bear fruit, needed no small courage and no little insight. But this is what Hooker attempted and carried through, and the history of the Church of England as we have known it since is the best testimony to the truth of his reasoning.

The delicate position of the English Church as to controversy lay and lies in this, that against Rome it pleads the authority of the Scriptures, and against Puritanism the authority of tradition. Hence logicians on both sides have been inclined to make merry at what has come to be called the English *Via Media*. Only, just as Aristotle insists that, while Virtue may be truly defined as a mean between extremes, it is, nevertheless, in respect of goodness an extreme;* so we must hold that the English Church is not compromised by deflections to the right and left. Hooker and the defenders of our Church who have followed him have refused to allow that a Church which appeals to a double principle is necessarily inferior to those which rest more simply upon a single one, since simplicity is not an attribute of Nature. In order to show that simplicity is not of the essence of Revelation either,† Hooker analyses the notion of divine

* ἀκρότης, *Nic. Eth.*, ii. 6, 17.

† "If we are to fix on any fundamental position as the key of [Hooker's] method of arguing, I should look for it in his doctrine, so pertinaciously urged and always implied, of the *concurrence and co-operation*, each in its due place, of all possible means of knowledge for man's direction. Take which you please, reason or Scripture, your own reason or that of others, private judgment or general consent, nature or grace, one *presupposes*—it is a favourite word

law, and his general conclusion, as against the Puritan idolisation of Scripture, may be summed up in the following memorable sentence :—

“Wisdom hath diversely imparted her treasures unto the world. As her ways are of sundry kinds, so her manner of teaching is not merely one and the same. Some things she openeth by the sacred books of Scripture; some things by the glorious works of Nature; with some things she inspireth them from above by spiritual influence; in some things she leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and practice. We may not so in any one special kind admire her that we disgrace her in any other; but let all her ways be according unto their place and degree adored” (*Ecc. Pol.* II. i. 4).

It may be said generally that Hooker's great achievement was to vindicate the English Church against the Puritan position on the ground of its reasonableness, its philosophical truth, and the correspondence of its principles with the broad facts of human life. Here was a Church that was content not to deny nature because it believed in grace, not to refuse tradition because it accepted the Scriptures, not to disobey human law because it acknowledged the existence of divine law. This reasonableness and breadth and veracity are exemplified in Hooker's own style. It is entirely free from those gross personalities common at the period, which disfigure, for instance, the Marprelate writings. What Walton says of Hooker's sermons is equally true of his treatise; its design was “to show reasons for what he spake, and with these reasons such a kind of rhetoric as did rather convince and persuade than frighten men.” In the preface to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, speaking of Cartwright's *Defence of the Admonitions*, Hooker says, “There will come a time when three

with him—the existence of others, and is not intended to do its work of illumination and guidance without them: and the man who elects to go by one alone will assuredly find in the end that he has gone wrong.”—CHURCH'S *Hooker*, book I. p. xvii.

words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." That he practised what he preached we may see not only in his contribution to the general controversy, the moderation of which we are apt to underrate because we cannot now regard his victory as anything but a foregone conclusion, but even more clearly in that particular part of it which most nearly touched his own person. Many people who know the story of the bickerings at the Temple, and how, in Fuller's words, "the forenoon's sermon spoke Canterbury and the afternoon's Geneva," may not have read the detailed history of the conflict as it is set out in Travers's "Supplication to the Council against his inhibition by the Archbishop," and Hooker's answer to the charges it contained against himself. They are worthy of perusal by anyone who would see in miniature a picture of the tempers of the two contending Churches; for there is far more in the difference than one between two individuals. Hooker set before him, here as elsewhere, that ideal of moderation and meekness which he and the leading Churchmen of his day held to be "primitive";* Travers is full of that aggressive self-sufficiency of spiritual office which marked all the leaders of his party. A short extract from each pamphlet will enable the reader to form a judgment both as to the matter controverted and the methods of the two advocates. After stating his resolution, on Hooker's being appointed Master, "constantly to seek for peace with him," Travers proceeds:—

"Which my resolution I so pursued that whereas I discovered sundry unsound matters in his doctrine (as many of his sermons

* Cf. Sir Henry Wotton's character of Whitgift: "He was a man of reverend and sacred memory, and of the *primitive* temper; such a temper as when the Church by *lowliness of spirit* did flourish in highest examples of virtue."

tasted of some sour leaven or other), yet thus I carried myself towards him. Matters of smaller weight, and so covertly delivered that no great offence to the Church was to be feared in them, I wholly passed by; for others of great moment and so openly delivered as there was just cause of fear lest the truth and Church of God should be prejudiced and perilled by it, and such as the conscience of my duty and calling would not suffer me altogether to pass over, this was my course; to deliver, when I should have just cause by my text, *the truth* of such doctrine as he had otherwise taught, in general speeches, without touch of his person in any sort, and further at convenient opportunity to confer with him on such points. According to which determination, whereas he had taught certain things concerning predestination *otherwise than the Word of God doth, as it is understood by all churches professing the gospel*. . . . I both delivered *the truth* of such points in a general doctrine without any touch of him in particular, and conferred with him also privately upon such articles. In which conference, I remember, when I urged the consent of all churches and good writers against him, that I knew; and desired, if it were otherwise, to understand what authors he had seen of such doctrine: he answered me, that his best author was his own reason."

To which charge Hooker replies first, that as Travers held it unlawful in the pulpit to cite any particular authority, lest it should seem to cast a doubt on the sufficiency of Scripture, but only allowed himself to say, on the one hand, "the Painims think this, or the heathen that," and on the other to quote "all churches" and "all good writers," he had not thought it worth while

"to control this over-reaching speech by sentences out of Church confessions, together with the best-learned monuments of further times, and not the meanest of our own: for what had this bootied me? . . . I alleged therefore that which might under no pretence be disallowed, namely reason; not meaning thereby mine own reason as now it is reported, but true, sound, divine reason; reason whereby those conclusions might be out of St. Paul demonstrated and not probably discoursed of only; reason

proper to that science whereby the things of God are known; theological reason, which, out of principles in Scripture that are plain, soundly deduceth more doubtful inferences, in such sort that being heard they neither can be denied, nor anything repugnant unto them received, but whatsoever was before otherwise by miscollecting gathered out of darker places is thereby forced to yield itself, and the true consonant meaning of sentences not understood is brought to light."

To appreciate the passages given above, it must be remembered that Travers was reputed one of the greatest preachers and most learned men of his day on the Puritan side, and that most of the Benchers and even Lord Burleigh had wished to make him Master instead of Hooker. If he and his party had triumphed, it is evident that the *Institutio* and Commentaries of John Calvin would have held a place in the English Church higher even than that from which the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas had been deposed; there would have been no appeal from them; for it is perfectly clear that by "all churches" and "all good writers" Mr. Travers had meant the churches in union with Geneva, and the preachers who followed Calvin. One other passage may be quoted from this instructive controversy for the light it throws upon the attitude of the two parties to the Church of Rome.

"When as [Hooker] had taught 'That the Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ, and a sanctified Church by profession of that truth which God hath revealed unto us by His Son, though not a pure and perfect Church'; and further 'That he doubted not but that thousands of the Fathers which lived and died in the superstitions of that Church were saved because of their ignorance which excused them'; misalleging to that end a text of Scripture to prove it (1 Tim. i. 13): the matter being of set purpose openly and at large handled by him, and of that moment that might prejudice the faith of Christ, encourage the ill-affected to continue still in their damnable ways, and others weak in faith to suffer themselves easily to be seduced to the

destruction of their souls; I thought it my most bounden duty to God and to His Church, whilst I might have opportunity to speak with him, to teach *the truth* in a general speech in such points of doctrine. At which time I taught, 'That such as die, or have died at any time in the Church of Rome, holding in their ignorance that faith which is taught in it, and namely justification in part by works, could not be said by the Scriptures to be saved. . . .' Mr. Hooker, the next Sabbath, leaving to proceed upon his ordinary text, professed to preach again that he had done the day before, for some question that his doctrine was drawn into, which he desired might be examined with all severity. So proceeding, he bestowed his whole time in that discourse, confirming his former doctrine, and answering the places of Scripture which I had alleged to prove that a man dying in the Church of Rome is not to be judged by the Scriptures to be saved. In which long speech, and utterly impertinent to his text, under colour of answering for himself, he impugned directly and openly to all men's understanding the *true* doctrine which I had delivered; and adding to his former points some other like (as willingly one error follows another) that is, 'That the Galatians, joining with faith in Christ circumcision as necessary to salvation, might be saved; and that they of the Church of Rome may be saved by such a faith of Christ as they have, with a general repentance of all their errors, notwithstanding their opinion of justification in part by their works and merits'; I was necessarily, though not willingly, drawn to say something to the points he objected against sound doctrine . . . which my answer, as it was most necessary for the service of God and the Church, so was it without any immodest or reproachful speech to Mr. Hooker: whose unsound and wilful dealings in a cause of so great importance to the faith of Christ and salvation of the Church, notwithstanding I knew well what speech it deserved, and what some zealous, earnest men of the spirit of John and James, surnamed Boanerges, Sons of Thunder, would have said in such case, yet I chose rather to content myself in exhorting him to revisit his doctrine, as Nathan the prophet did the device, which, without consulting with God, he had of himself given to David concerning the building of the Temple; and with Peter the Apostle to endure to be withstood in such a case, not unlike unto this?"

It would be tedious to give Hooker's answer in detail ;* but it may be interesting to give here a short passage from the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, in which he expresses in a lucid sentence what should be the attitude of any true Church, and is the attitude of the Church of England, towards the Church of Rome :—

“To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men ; in that they are wise men and Christian men some things ; some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow wisdom and truth we fear not to tread the self-same steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect, leaving it for newer and changing it for worse ; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love” (v. xxviii. 1).

From what has been quoted the reader will probably agree that, if Hooker may be taken as representing the special genius of the English Church, we may claim for that Church a breadth of view, a devotion to truth, wherever found, and a faith in right reason which sharply distinguish her from Puritanism on the one side and Romanism on the other. One of the beautiful vignettes

* It is a happiness to be able to point out that all the great Anglicans demurred in strong terms to the damnation so lavishly distributed by both Romanists and Puritans ; thus Laud, speaking of the Calvinist doctrine of Reprobation, says : “Which opinion my very soul abominates ; for it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world.” And so Chillingworth, against the Roman position that disagreeing Protestants must be damned since some of them must needs deny revealed truth, says : “Let all such errors be as damnable as you please to make 'em, in the meanwhile if they suffer themselves neither to be betrayed into their errors, nor kept in them, by any sin of their will ; if they do their best endeavour to free themselves from all errors, and yet fail of it through human frailty ; so well am I persuaded of the goodness of God that if in me alone should meet a confluence of all such errors of all the Protestants in the world that were thus qualified, *I should not be so much afraid of them all as I should be to ask pardon for them.*”

which Walton gives us in his life of Hooker is the picture of that pastor tending his few sheep in the common field while he reads the Odes of Horace. Between the temper of mind which speaks of "all the Pains writers," and that larger humanity which can appreciate, as Newman says, "the sad earnestness and vivid exactness of lines, the birth of some chance morning or evening among the Sabine Hills," the English nation has chosen, and, as most of us think, chosen wisely. The larger humanity that we find in Hooker we find no less in the other great leaders of the Church at this period. Among the friends of Bishop Andrewes was numbered Francis Bacon, who submitted to his judgment *The Advancement of Learning*, and dedicated to him the unwritten *Holy War*; a specially intimate friend was the great scholar Isaac Casaubon, who found in the English Church a love of learning and reverence for antiquity for which he had looked in vain among Calvinists and Huguenots. I will not attempt any examination of Andrewes' Sermons, because they are to-day little read, and perhaps can hardly be reckoned as living literature;* but I will call attention to some

* There is an eloquent eulogy of them in a paper by Dean Church (*Masters in English Theology*, p. 95) from which a short passage may be extracted, especially as it calls attention to one feature of them which is typically Anglican. After speaking of the preaching of the previous generation, he says: "In Andrewes you feel as if he had broken bounds. You see at once a wider horizon, objects of faith and contemplation at once more real, more personal, more august; you become aware of your relation to a vaster and more diversified world, a world full of mystery, yet touching you on every side. Doctrine you have, dogmatic teaching as precise and emphatic as anywhere; but it is doctrine as wide as the Scripture in its comprehensiveness and variety, reflecting at every turn the unutterable and overwhelming wonders which rise before us when we think of what we mean by the creeds, corresponding in its dignity, in its versatile application, to the real history of man, to the deep and manifold wants of the soul, its aspirations, its terrible sins, its cruel fears, its capacities for hope and delight, the strange fortunes of the race, and of the story of each individual life. His theology was instinct with the awful consciousness of our immense and hopeless ignorance of the ways and counsels of God—with that shrinking from speculation on the secret things of the most High which he shared with Hooker, and which, as a professed law of divinity,

qualities of his *Devotions*, which still, perhaps more than ever, live in the hands and on the lips of English worshippers. I would notice, first of all, that characteristic which is so prominent in Hooker—the recognition of the work of reason in the world as an ordinance of God:—

“O King of nations, unto the ends of the earth;
strengthen all the states
of the inhabited world,
as being Thy ordinance,
though a creation of man,” etc.

(*First Day—Intercession.*)

In the second place, one remarks the breadth of their sympathy in intercession, and of their acknowledgment in praise, and how both praises and intercessions mirror life sanely and truly. For an example, consider the Intercession for the Second Day, which, to save space, I will write down, except for one specially important passage, in continuous prose (following Newman's version):—

“Let us pray God for the whole creation; for the supply of seasons, healthy, fruitful, peaceful; for the whole race of mankind; for those who are not Christians; for the conversion of Atheists, the ungodly; Gentiles, Turks, and Jews; for all Christians; for restoration of all who languish in faults and sins; for confirmation of all who have been granted truth and grace; for succour and comfort of all who are dispirited, infirm, distressed, unsettled, men and women; for thankfulness and sobriety in all who are hearty, healthy, prosperous, quiet, men and women;

for the Catholic Church, its establishment and increase;
for the Eastern, its deliverance and union;
for the Western, its adjustment and peace;
for the British, the supply of what is wanting in it,
the strengthening of what remains in it;

was something new in the theological world of the day. “For these sixteen years since I was ordained priest,” he says in his judgment on the Lambeth Articles, “I have never, publicly or privately, disputed or preached on these mysteries of predestination.”

for the episcopate, presbytery, Christian people ; for the states of the inhabited world ; for Christian states, far off, near at hand ; for our own ; for all in rule ; for our divinely-guarded King ; the queen and the prince ; for those who have place in the court ; for parliament and judicature, army and police, commons and their leaders, farmers, graziers, fishers, merchants, traders, and mechanics, down to mean workmen, and the poor ; for the rising generation ; for the good nurture of all the royal family, of the young ones of the nobility ; for all in universities, in law colleges, in schools in town or country, in apprenticeships ; for those who have a claim on me from relationship, for brothers and sisters, that God's blessing may be on them, and on their children ; OR from benefit conferred, that Thy recompense may be on all who have benefitted me, who have ministered to me in carnal things ; OR from trust placed in me, for all whom I have educated, all whom I have ordained ; for my college, my parish, Southwell, St. Paul's, Westminster, Dioceses of Chichester, Ely, and my present [Winchester] clergy, people, helps, governments, the deanery in the chapel royal, the almonry, the colleges committed to me [as Visitor] ; OR from natural kindness, for all who love me, though I know them not ; OR from Christian love ; for those who hate me without cause, some too even on account of truth and righteousness ; OR from neighbourhood, for all who dwell near me peaceably and harmlessly ; OR from promise, for all whom I have promised to remember in my prayers ; OR from mutual offices, for all who remember me in their prayers, and ask of me the same ; OR from stress of engagements, for all who on sufficient reasons fail to call upon Thee ; for all who have no intercessor in their own behalf ; for all who at present are in agony of extreme necessity or deep affliction ; for all who are attempting any good work which will bring glory to the Name of God or some great good to the Church ; for all who act nobly either towards things sacred or towards the poor ; for all who have ever been offended by me either in word or in deed."

Side by side with this may be placed one of the Acts of Thanksgiving, that for the Fifth Day :—

"O Lord, my Lord, for my being, life, reason ; for nurture, protection, guidance ; for education, civil rights, religion ; for Thy gifts of grace, nature, fortune ; for redemption, regeneration, catechising ; for my call, recall, yea many calls besides ; for Thy

forbearance, long-suffering, long long-suffering to me-ward ; many seasons, many years, up to this time ; for all good things received, successes granted me, good things done ; for the use of things present, for Thy promise, and my hope of the enjoyment of good things to come ; for my parents honest and good, teachers kind, benefactors never to be forgotten, religious intimates congenial, hearers thoughtful, friends sincere, domestics faithful ; for all who have advantaged me by writings, homilies, converse, prayers, patterns, rebukes, injuries ; for all these, and all others which I know, which I know not ; open, hidden ; remembered, forgotten ; done when I wished, when I wished not ; I confess to Thee, and will confess ; I bless Thee, and will bless ; I give thanks to Thee, and will give thanks, all the days of my life."

We cannot fail to notice that these world-wide praises and intercessions became possible on no narrower basis than the Church's Creed. Such a thanksgiving, for instance, as that just quoted could not have been written by anyone who held the doctrine of the "Lambeth Articles" upon predestination. Finally, the *Devotions* bring clearly into view the type of character which Andrewes sets before himself as an ideal. From the Prayer for Grace on the Fourth Day let me extract two petitions which seem typically English in their common sense and honesty, and also in their combination of saintly qualities of mind with the practical recognition that poverty is not in northern climes a bride to be wooed :—

"Give me
humility, pitifulness, patience,
sobriety, purity, contentment, ready zeal.

* * * * *

Grant me a happy life
in piety, gravity, purity,
in all things good and fair,
in cheerfulness, in health, in credit,
in competency, in safety, in gentle estate, in quiet ;
a happy death,
a deathless happiness."

Next in order, after Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* and Andrewes' *Devotions*, among the evidences which exhibit and the influences which helped to shape the peculiar temper of the Anglican Church, must be placed the writings we associate with the great names of John Donne and George Herbert. They were both men in the foremost intellectual rank of their day—scholars and gentlemen, even courtiers; both fought long and hard against the divine decrees which were urging them to the ministry; but both, when their decision was once made, threw themselves heart and soul into their new profession, and by their zeal and genius created, we may almost say, a new type—the one of a town preacher, the other of a country parson. Their influence upon their own age was exercised in Donne's case by his sermons; in Herbert's through his poems; and both these influences still operate. But it is probable that the impression their character has exerted upon later generations is quite as much due to the portraits of them which have been handed down by the religious genius of Izaak Walton, who may himself be said to have first exhibited in English literature the type of the Anglican layman as we know him to-day—devout, reasonable, modest. Readers of Walton's delightful biographies will recall his fondness for the appeal to antiquity, "those first and most blessed times of Christianity;" they will remember that he justifies Donne and Herbert for writing sacred poems by the example of Prudentius, and the use of Church music from St. Augustine's love of it; that his highest epithet of praise is "primitive," and that it is commonly found with the words "humility" or "charity." Another trait that he is never tired of emphasising in the characters of the worthies he had known and loved is their averseness from controversy. In his sketch of the life of Sir Henry Wotton, the distinguished ambassador of James to

Venice, afterwards Provost of Eton, a Churchman and angler after Walton's own heart, he collects various anecdotes, some of which may find a place here, as they throw a light on the way in which the current controversies were viewed by those who had a zeal for the true welfare of the Church.

"He was a great enemy to wrangling disputes of Religion, concerning which I shall say a little, both to testify that and to show the readiness of his wit. Having at his being in Rome made acquaintance with a pleasant Priest, who invited him one evening to hear their Vesper music at church, the Priest, seeing Sir Henry stand obscurely in a corner, sends to him by a boy of the choir this question writ in a small piece of paper: 'Where was your religion *to be found before Luther?*'*" To which question Sir Henry presently underwrit: 'My religion was to be found *then* where yours is not to be found *now*, in the written Word of God.' The next Vesper Sir Henry went purposely to the same church, and sent one of the choir boys with this question to his honest, pleasant friend, the priest: 'Do you believe all those many thousands of poor Christians were damned, that were excommunicated because the Pope and the Duke of Venice could not agree about their temporal power, even those poor Christians that knew not why they quarrelled? Speak your conscience.' To which he underwrit in French: 'Monsieur, excusez-moi.' To one that asked him 'Whether a Papist may be saved?' he replied, 'You may be saved without knowing that. Look to yourself.' To another, whose earnestness exceeded his knowledge and was still railing against the Papists, he gave this advice: 'Pray, sir, forbear till you have studied the points better; for the wise Italians have this proverb: "He that understands amiss concludes worse." And take heed of thinking the farther you go from the Church of Rome, the nearer you are to God.'"

The last two stories, and others of the like sort to be

* Donne's answer to this stock question may be quoted: "They that ask now *Where was your Church before Luther?* would then have asked of the Jews, *Where was your Church before Esdras?* That was in Babylon, ours was in Rome."—Second sermon on Ezek. xxxiv. 19.

found in Walton, explain the feeling which made Wotton, in Walton's phrase, "choose for the epitaph on his tombstone only this prudent, pious sentence to discover his disposition and preserve his memory :—

‘His jacet hujus sententiæ primus Author :
Disputandi pruritus, ecclesiarum scabies ;’

which may be Englished thus : ‘Here lies the first author of this sentence : The itch of disputation will prove the scab of the Church.’ ”

Donne was eminently fitted to be an advocate of the *via media*, seeing that he had won his way to it from the Roman faith, to which his mother's family had supplied martyrs and confessors. While still a layman Donne had made himself very learned in the controversy between the Churches, helping Morton, afterwards Bishop of Durham, in his polemical works, and himself contributing a book, the *Pseudomartyr*, on the question of the Oath of Allegiance ; and in his sermons he steers his way between the two parties with a fine religious tact, being equally on the alert to press home points in which he considered the Roman Church to have gone astray, and to expose the pretensions of Calvinistic omniscience ; but refusing to be deterred by any shibboleths from welcoming truth wherever he recognised it. He says in one place :—

“Beloved, there are some things in which all religions agree : the worship of God, the holiness of life. Therefore, if when I study this holiness of life, and fast, and pray, and submit myself to discreet and medicinal mortifications for the subduing of my body, any man will say, ‘This is papistical ! Papists do this !’ it is a blessed protestation, and no man is the less a Protestant or the worse a Protestant for making it : ‘I am a Papist ! that is, I will fast and pray as much as any Papist, and enable myself for the service of my God, as seriously, as sedulously, as laboriously as any Papist.’ So if, when I startle and am affected at a blasphemous oath as at a wound upon my Saviour, when I avoid the conversation of those men that profane the

Lord's Day, any other will say, 'This is puritanical! Puritans do this!' it is a blessed protestation, and no man is the less a Protestant nor the worse a Protestant for making it: 'Men and brethren, I am a Puritan! that is, I will endeavour to be pure as my Father in heaven is pure, as far as any Puritan'" (i. 493).

We notice in Donne how, like Hooker and Andrewes, he resented the fierce controversial style of the day. In one of his letters, speaking of a book written on the Anglican side against Rome, he says it is written "for religion, without it"; and in a sermon preached before the Court (ii. 254) he takes occasion, in pointing out how loth St. Augustine was to accuse Tertullian of heresy, to deprecate the abuse of that term to every difference between the churches.

"I would Saint Augustine's charity might prevail with them that pretend to be *Augustinianissimi*, and to admire him so much in the Roman Church, not to cast the name of heresy upon every problem, nor the name of heretic upon every inquirer of truth. St. Augustine would deliver Tertullian from heresy in a point concerning God, and they will condemn us of heresy in every point that may be drawn to concern, not the Church, but the Court of Rome; not their doctrine, but their profit. I shall better answer God for my mildness than for my severity. And though anger against a brother, or a *Raca*, or a *Fool* will bear an action, yet he shall recover less against me at that bar whom I have called weak or misled (as I must necessarily call many in the Roman Church) than he whom I have passionately and peremptorily called heretic. For I dare call an opinion heresy for the matter a great while before I dare call the man that holds it an heretic. For that consists much in the manner. It must be matter of faith before the matter be heresy; but there must be pertinacy after convenient instruction before that man be a heretic."

As Donne's sermons are now little known, I may be excused for quoting a few passages to exhibit the

importance which he, like the other Anglican leaders, attached to reverence in all offices of devotion. First, as to the reasonableness of ritual:—

“Quench not the light of nature, suffer not *that* light to go out; study your natural faculties, husband and improve them; and love the outward acts of religion, though an hypocrite, and though a natural man may do them. He that cares not though the material church fall, I am afraid, is falling from the spiritual. For can a man be sure to have his money or his plate if his house be burnt, or to preserve his faith if the outward exercises of religion fail? He that undervalues outward things in the religious service of God, though he begin at ceremonial and ritual things, will come quickly to call Sacraments but outward things, and Sermons and Public Prayers but outward things in contempt. As some Platonic philosophers did so over-refine religion and devotion as to say that nothing but the *first* thoughts and ebullitions of a devout heart were fit to serve God in; if it came to any outward action of the body, kneeling, or lifting up of heads, if it came to be but invested in our words, and so made a prayer, nay, if it passed but a revolving, a turning in our inward thoughts, and thereby were mingled with our affections, though pious affections, yet, say they, it is not pure enough for a service to God; nothing but the first motions of the heart is for Him. Beloved, outward things apparel God; and since God was content to take a body, let us not leave Him naked nor ragged” (ii. 330).

In regard to keeping set times of devotion, Donne has a few careful sentences in a sermon on the text, “For this shall everyone that is godly make his prayer unto Thee in a time when Thou mayest be found”:—

“This *time* is not those *Horæ stativæ*, *Horæ Canonice*, those fixed hours in the Roman Church where men are bound to certain prayers at certain hours. Not that it is inconvenient for men to bind themselves to certain fixed times of prayer in their private exercises; and though not by such a vow as that it shall be an impiety, yet by so solemn a purpose as that it shall be a levity to break it” (i. 596).

But he has no toleration for the practice of treating prayers as so much matter to be got through; for such a notion conflicts with the very idea of prayer as devotion, which even when we do our best is sure to be imperfect:—

“We have not leisure to speak of the abuse of prayer in the Roman Church; where they will antedate and postdate their prayers; say to-morrow’s prayers to-day, and to-day’s prayers to-morrow, if they have other uses and employments of the due times between; where they will trade and make merchandise of prayers by way of exchange; my man shall fast for me, and I will pray for my man; or my attorney and proxy shall pray for us both at my charge; nay, where they will play for prayers, and the loser must pray for both; to this there belongs but a holy scorn, and I would fain pass it over quickly. But when we consider with a religious seriousness the manifold weaknesses of the strongest devotions in time of prayer, it is a sad consideration. I throw myself down in my chamber, and I call in and invite God and His angels thither, and when they are there, I neglect God and His angels for the noise of a fly, for the rattling of a coach, for the whining of a door, I talk on in the same posture of praying, eyes lifted up, knees bowed down, as though I prayed to God; and if God or His angels should ask me when I thought last of God in that prayer, I cannot tell; sometimes I find that I had forgot what I was about, but when I began to forget it I cannot tell. A memory of yesterday’s pleasures, a fear of to-morrow’s dangers, a straw under my knee, a noise in mine ear, a light in mine eye, an anything, a nothing, a fancy, a chimæra in my brain, troubles me in my prayer. So certainly is there nothing, nothing in spiritual things, perfect in this world” (i. 820).

A very interesting passage upon ceremonies in general, arising out of a discussion on the question of lights, comes in a sermon on the Purification:—

“It is in this ceremony of lights as it is in other ceremonies; they may be good in their institution and grow ill in their practice. So did many things, which the Christian Church received from the Gentiles in a harmless innocency, degenerate after into as

pestilent superstition there as amongst the Gentiles themselves. For ceremonies which were received but for the instruction and edification of the weaker sort of people, were made real parts of the service of God and meritorious sacrifices. To those ceremonies which were received as *signa commonefacientia*, helps to excite and awaken devotion, was attributed an operative and an effectual power, even to the ceremony itself; and they were not practised as they should be, *significative* but *effective*, not as things which should signify to the people higher mysteries, but as things as powerful and effectual in themselves as the greatest mysteries of all, the Sacraments themselves. So lights were received in the Primitive Church to signify to the people that God, the Father of lights, was otherwise present in that place than in any other, and then men came to offer lights by way of sacrifice to God. And so that which was providently intended for man, who, indeed, needed such helps, was turned upon God as though He were to be supplied by us. But what then? Because things good in their intention may be depraved in their practice—‘*Er-gone nihil ceremoniarum rudioribus dabitur ad juvandam eorum imperitiam?*’ Shall therefore the people be denied all ceremonies for the assistance of their weakness? ‘*Id ego non dico*’; I say not so, says he.* ‘*Omnino illis utile esse sentio hoc genus adminiculi*’; I think these kinds of helps to be very behooveful for them—‘*Tantum hoc contendo*’; all that I strive for is but moderation; and that moderation he places very discreetly in this, that these ceremonies may be few in number, that they may be easy for observation; that they may be clearly understood in their signification. We must not therefore be hasty in condemning particular ceremonies, for in so doing in this ceremony of lights we may condemn the Primitive Church that did use them, and we condemn a great and noble part of the Reformed Church which doth use them at this day” (i. 80).

Donne not unfrequently in his sermons takes occasion to defend the English Church for its assiduity in preaching,

* The authority here adduced by Donne is that of Calvin, whose reputation at this time in England stood very high, and whom Donne always refers to with respect, and quotes very happily against those who counted themselves his followers.

but at the same time he is careful to warn the clergy against mere appeals to the emotions which do not touch the reason and conscience :—

“If they [the Roman Catholics] deride us for often preaching, and call us fools for that, as David said, ‘He would be more vile,’ he would dance more, so let us be more fools in the foolishness of preaching, and preach more. If they think us mad, since we are mad for your souls (as the apostle speaks) let us be more mad. Let him that hath preached once do it twice, and him that hath preached twice do it thrice; but yet not thus, by coming to a negligent and extemporal manner of preaching” (i. 325).

He points out that though extemporal sermons may have been justified in primitive times on account of the greater ignorance of the people, the advance in education in his day laid a greater claim upon the preacher. On the other hand, he calls attention to the fact that those sectaries who exalt preaching out of its place into the sole means of grace soon come to treat it as a merely human ordinance, which they may attend and criticise without any feeling of reverence. He adds that unlearned preaching is the first step to heresy, and leads ultimately to schism. The sense of the following paragraph must be judged apart from its relevance to the text from which it is educed :—

“When the apostle says, *Study to be quiet* (1 Thess. iv. 11), methinks he intimates something towards this, that the less we study for our sermons, the more danger is there to disquiet the auditory; extemporal, unpremeditated sermons that serve the popular ear, vent for the most part doctrines that disquiet the Church. *Study* for them and they will *be quiet*; consider ancient and fundamental doctrines, and this will quiet and settle the understanding and the conscience. Many of these extemporal men have gone away from us, and vainly said that they have as good cause to separate from us as we from

Rome.* But can they call our Church 'a *Babylon*, confusion, disorder'? All that offends them is that we have too much order, too much regularity, too much binding to the orderly and uniform service of God in His Church" (ii. 216).

I have illustrated by these few passages the general line which Donne took in matters debated in his day, so as to show his notion of the Anglican ideal; but, for the most part, his sermons come up to the type which George Herbert lays down for all sermons, "that their main character should be not controversial but holy, the words and sentences being dipped and seasoned in the heart of the preacher before they come into the mouth."

The book from which that sentence comes—*A Priest to the Temple; or, the Country Parson, his Character and Rule of Holy Life*—is an invaluable document for letting us see what the best spirits in the second generation of Anglican divines thought of their office and its duties and the Church in which they ministered.

* The justification of the English breach with Rome is handled earlier in the same sermon in a curious passage that may be quoted as a specimen of the wit that made Donne famous in the days before his ordination, though it is rare in his sermons (ii. 214).

"They vex us now with the question, Why if your fathers, when they eat our trodden grass and drunk our troubled waters, were sound and in health and continued sheep, and God's sheep and God's flock, His Church with us, why went they from us? They owed us their residence, because they had received their baptism from us. And truly it is not an impertinent, a frivolous reason that of baptism, where there is nothing but conveniency and no necessity in the case. But if I be content to stay with my friend in an aguish air, will he take it ill if I go when the plague comes? Or if I stay in town till twenty die of the plague, shall it be looked that I should stay when there die one thousand? The infection grew hotter and hotter in Rome, and their *may* came to a *must*; those things which were done before *de facto*, came at last to be articles of faith and *de jure*, must be believed and practised upon salvation. They chide us for going away, and they drove us away; if we abstained from communicating with their poisons (being now grown to that height) they excommunicated us; they gave us no room amongst them but the fire, and they were so forward to burn heretics that they called it heresy not to stay to be burnt."

"A Pastor," Herbert begins, "is the deputy of Christ, to reduce [bring back] man to the obedience of God. Out of this charter of the priesthood may be plainly gathered both the dignity thereof and the duty: the dignity, in that a priest may do that which Christ did, and by his authority, and as his vicegerent; the duty, in that a priest is to do that which Christ did, and after His manner, both for doctrine and life."

"The Country Parson," he continues, "is exceedingly exact in his life, being holy, just, prudent, temperate, bold, grave in all his ways. . . . To put on the profound humility and the exact temperance of our Lord Jesus Christ, with other exemplary virtues of that sort, and to keep them on in the sunshine and noon of prosperity, he findeth to be as necessary, and as difficult at least, as to be clothed with perfect patience and Christian fortitude in the cold midnight storms of persecution and adversity."

In the conduct of public worship what Herbert most dwells upon is the necessity for reverence.

"The Country Parson being to administer the Sacraments, is at a stand with himself how or what behaviour to assume for so holy things. Especially at Communion times he is in a great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him. Neither finds he any issue in this, but to throw himself down at the throne of grace saying, 'Lord, Thou knowest what Thou didst when Thou appointedst it to be done thus; therefore do Thou fulfil what Thou didst appoint, for Thou art not only the Feast but the way to it.' For the manner of receiving, as the parson *useth all reverence himself*, so he administers to none but the *reverent*. The Feast indeed requires sitting because it is a Feast; but man's unpreparedness asks kneeling. He that comes to the Sacrament hath the confidence of a guest, and he that kneels confesseth himself an unworthy one, and therefore differs from other feasters; but he that sits or lies, puts up to an apostle. *Contentiousness in a feast of charity is more scandal than any posture*. At Baptism, being himself in white, he requires the presence of all, and baptiseth not willingly but on Sundays or great days. He says that prayer *with great devotion* where God is thanked for calling us to the knowledge of

His grace, Baptism being a blessing that the world hath not the like. He willingly and cheerfully crosseth the child, and thinketh the ceremony not only innocent but reverent. . . . The Country Parson, when he is to read divine services, composeth himself *to all possible reverence*; this he doth, first, as being truly touched and amazed with the majesty of God, before whom he then presents himself; yet not as himself alone, but as presenting with himself the whole congregation, whose sins he then bears and brings with his own to the heavenly altar to be bathed and washed in the sacred laver of Christ's blood. Secondly, as this is the true reason of his inward fear, so he is content to express thus outwardly to the utmost of his power, that being first affected himself he may affect also his people, knowing that no sermon moves them so much to a reverence, which they forget again when they come to pray, as a devout behaviour in the very act of praying. . . . The character of his sermons is *holiness*; it is gained first by choosing texts of devotion, not controversy, moving and ravishing texts, whereof the Scriptures are full."

As reverence is to be the predominant note of the parson and people, so decency and order are to prevail in the church and its furniture.

"The Country Parson hath a special care of his church, that all things there be decent and befitting His Name by which it is called. Therefore first he taketh order that all things be in good repair: as walls plastered; windows glazed; floor paved; seats whole, firm, and uniform; especially that the Pulpit and Desk, and Communion Table and Font be as they ought for those great duties that are performed in them. Secondly, that the church be swept and kept clean, without dust or cobwebs, and at great festivals strawed and stuck with boughs, and perfumed with incense. . . . And all this he doth, not as out of necessity, or as putting a holiness in the things, but as desiring to keep the *middle way* between superstition and slovenliness, and as following the apostle's two great and admirable rules on things of this nature: the first whereof is, *Let all things be done decently and in order*; the second, *Let all things be done to edification*."

The same idea of the English ritual as a mean between

those of Rome and Geneva is found in Herbert's poem of *The British Church*:—

"A fine aspect in fit array,
Neither too mean nor yet too gay,
Shows who is best.
Outlandish [*i.e.* foreign] looks may not compare,
For all they either painted are
Or else undrest.

"She on the hills, which wantonly
Allureth all, in hope to be
By her preferr'd,
Hath kiss'd so long her painted shrines,
That e'en her face, by kissing, shines
For her reward.

"She in the valley is so shy
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
About her ears ;
While she avoids her neighbour's pride,
She wholly goes on th' other side,
And nothing wears."

But if the note of reverence is plainly struck all through *The Country Parson*, the other Anglican note of reasonableness is no less prominent. In his remarks on Preaching, Herbert is in advance of the practice of his day. "A sermon," he says, "should consist of a plain and evident declaration of the meaning of the text," followed by "some choice observations drawn out of the whole text as it lies entire and unbroken in the Scripture itself." To crumble a text into small parts "hath in it," he says, "neither sweetness nor gravity, since the words apart are not Scripture but a dictionary." In another place he adds that a text must be considered "with the coherence thereof, touching what goes before and what follows after," as also the place where it comes in the canon. The same reasonable temper justifies both the appeal to the Fathers and the use of the preacher's own judgment. "As he doth not so study others as to neglect the grace of God in himself and what the Holy Spirit teacheth him, so doth he assure

himself that God in all ages hath had His servants to whom He hath revealed His truth, as well as to him." The like spirit of sanctified common sense is displayed in his treatment of Fasting, upon which subject his remarks are worth attention at the present day, when reason in such matters seems in some quarters at a discount. The passage is too long to quote; it will be found in the chapter entitled "A parson in his house." To Private Confession he has the following short reference:—

"In his visiting the sick or otherwise afflicted he followeth the Church's counsel, namely, in persuading them to particular confession, labouring to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious ordinance, and how necessary it is in some cases."

On turning to Herbert's poems, the reader finds little, notwithstanding their title of *The Temple* or *Church*, that has upon the surface any immediate reference to the Church of England. Besides *The British Church*, quoted above, there is a lament upon *Church Rents and Schisms*, an apology for declining the invocation of Saints, (*To all Saints and Angels*), a passing reflection upon the Roman doctrine of merit in *Judgment*, some lines upon *Church Music*, and a very sad forecast, which has happily been falsified, of the decay of English religion in the poem called *The Church Militant*. Besides these, and a few poems upon his own ordination, it may seem at first sight as if there were nothing in the volume to determine it to any one Communion. But a more attentive consideration reveals the fact that a large proportion of the poems are poems of personal devotion, acts of faith, acts of praise—exercises which Puritanism was inclined to rank as idle; and further, that the devotional poems are pitched in a key whose reserve contrasts strikingly with the fiery ardours and ecstasies characteristic of the Roman church. Mr. Shorthouse, in an interesting preface to the facsimile

reprint of *The Temple* (Unwin, 1883)—a preface which, among much that is fantastic and uncritical, contains several penetrating comments—lays it down that it was the peculiar mission of Herbert and his fellows to reveal to the uncultured and unlearned "the true refinement of worship." The phrase seems to be an eminently happy one. For just as in their ordinary social life Englishmen value taste above mere profusion and display, and reticence above self-abandonment to exuberant feelings, so in divine worship we associate reverence with the prophet's veiled lips rather than with the gush of sensibility, however eloquent. We approach the altar with "reverence and godly fear"; we should wish our feelings there to be calm, sober, contemplative. It is this temper, serious, solemnised, and humble with the dignity of a child of God, to which Herbert has given so perfect an expression. It passes through many moods—praise, expostulation, penitence, longing, love—but they are all touched with the same grave restraint. How full of dignity is the deprecation of the poem called *Discipline!*

"Throw away thy rod,
Throw away thy wrath,
O my God!
Take the gentle path.

"For my heart's desire
Unto Thine is bent;
I aspire
To a full consent.

"Though I fail, I weep;
Though I halt in pace,
Yet I creep
To the throne of grace.

"Throw away thy rod!
Though man frailties hath,
Thou art God!
Throw away thy wrath.'

The same calm and confident faith inspires the well-known poem called *Praise*, which begins—

“King of glory, King of peace,
I will love Thee.”

And there are many others in the same key. Even the poems to our Lord, where more effusion is naturally in place, are entirely lacking in that tone of familiarity which is so distressing in many devotions used by Romanists and our own dissenters. We find a rare sweetness indeed, but no want of delicacy or refinement. What could be more humble in spirit, with all its affection, than the piece called *Dialogue*, which opens—

“Sweetest Saviour, if my love
Were but worth the having”?

or that exquisite verse on the Resurrection—

“I got me flowers to strew Thy way ;
I got me boughs off many a tree :
But Thou wast up by break of day,
And broughtst Thy sweets along with Thee”?

The difference between the Anglican and Roman spirit in these matters may be seen by putting a verse from Herbert side by side with one from Crashaw, choosing from the latter not poems like *The Flaming Heart* or *The Assumption of the Virgin*, with the subjects of which we should be out of sympathy, but a direct address to our Lord that might be made by any Christian, such as the following “Song” :—

“Lord, when the sense of Thy sweet grace
Sends up my soul to seek Thy face,
Thy blessed eyes breed such desire
I die in Love’s delicious fire.
O Love, I am Thy sacrifice ;
Be still triumphant, blessed eyes !
Still shine on me, fair suns, that I
Still may behold, though still I die.

“Though still I die, I live again,
Still longing so to be still slain;
So gainful is such loss of breath,
I die even in desire of death.
Still live in me this longing strife
Of living death and dying life;
For while Thou sweetly slayest me,
Dead to myself I live in Thee.”

The nearest poem to that in point of subject among Herbert's is the poem called *The Glance*, which contains the same general imagery of eyes and sun, but is written in a tone that would never allow itself such an epithet as “delicious.”

“When first Thy sweet and gracious eye
Vouchsafed, even in the midst of youth and night,
To look upon me, who before did lie
 Weltering in sin,

“I felt a sugar'd, strange delight,
Passing all cordials made by any art,
Bedew, embalm, and overrun my heart,
 And take it in.

“Since that time many a bitter storm
My soul hath felt; ev'n able to destroy,
Had the malicious and ill-meaning harm
 His swing and sway.

“But still, Thy sweet, original joy,
Sprung from Thine eye, did work within my soul,
And surging griefs, when they grew bold, control;
 And get the day.

“If Thy first glance so powerful be,
A mirth but open'd and sealed up again;
What wonders shall we feel when we shall see
 Thy full-ey'd love!

“When Thou shalt look us out of pain;
And one aspect of Thine spend in delight
More than a thousand suns disburse in light
 In heaven above.”

No consideration of Herbert's *Temple*, however slight, must omit mention of that long and elaborate poem

which he entitles *The Church Porch*, a series of gnomic quatrains on the conduct to be expected of a Christian gentleman. While so many of the Puritan preachers and lecturers in Herbert's day were delectating their flocks with curious points of doctrine, "reasoning high," like Milton's philosophical devils—

"Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate—
Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute ;
And found no end in wandering mazes lost " ;

with the result, to quote Milton again, that "their hungry sheep looked up and were not fed, but swollen with wind, rotted inwardly,"* Herbert tasks himself to apply to the particular faults of his own class a particular remedy. Sager and more appealing dissuasions from the sins of the flesh, sounder and more generous counsels on the conduct of life were surely never penned. What could be better than this ?

"Art thou a Magistrate? then be severe ;
If studious, copy fair what time hath blurr'd,
Redeem Truth from his jaws ; if soldier,
Chase brave employments with a naked sword
Throughout the world. Fool not ; for all may have,
If they dare try, a glorious life or grave."

I could wish that *The Church Porch* were printed separately and given to every boy in our public schools ; it would advantage him more than hearing sermons. At any rate, *The Church Porch* is among the best witnesses to the reasonable and practical spirit—the ἐπιείκεια and σωφροσύνη—characteristic of our communion.

I will call but one more witness—George Herbert's "dear and deserving brother," Nicholas Ferrar, who, the

* The Italian ambassador of the day observed that "the common people of England were wiser than the wisest of his nation, for here the very women and shopkeepers were able to judge of predestination." As a natural consequence we have many testimonies to the decay of morals.

son of a merchant, and himself enjoying a wide reputation for skill in the management of affairs, took deacon's orders at the age of thirty-four, and retired with his mother and a large family of kinsfolk to the manor house of Little Gidding in Huntingdonshire, in order to live a life of prayer, contemplation, and alms-deeds. He had been allowed his degree at Cambridge before the statutory age in recognition of his mature scholarship, and had given special attention to Church history. Afterwards he travelled through Germany, Italy and Spain, studying everywhere the customs of the Churches, and the effect of the customs upon life and manners; and he came back to England with clear convictions upon two points: first, that the soul of the Church was the worship of God, and that worship in England had been almost extinguished by controversy; secondly, that the Roman Mass did not, as its defenders alleged,* tend to real worship, but, on the contrary, was in its tendency even anti-Christian. His brother records a saying of his about the Roman Mass, that if it were celebrated in his house he would pull down the room in which it had been said and build it up again. Nevertheless Ferrar did not escape the charge of Popery; it was enough that he lived in a religious community, "an Arminian nunnery," as it was called. On the other hand, he was also taunted with Puritanism from the temperate mode of life practised at Gidding, so much at variance with the lavishness of the day, which reduced many old families to poverty. A very interesting letter has been preserved from a Mr. Lenton of Gray's Inn, who, like many other curious observers of the day, paid Gidding a visit, in which he

* Cardinal Newman, in *Loss and Gain*, revived this specious plea, contending that Anglican worship was only *invocation* of God, whereas Roman worship was an *evocation*; but if God is a Spirit, why should a substantial presence be more worshipped than a spiritual presence?

gives a full description of the chapel and the service there. We learn that the holy table was not placed altarwise ; * that the prayer-desk was made of the same height as the pulpit, in order that prayer might not be degraded below preaching in the estimation of the worshippers, as it too commonly was in those days ;—Walton tells us that George Herbert made the same arrangement in the church he restored at Leighton ;—and that the chapel was “fairly and sweetly adorned with herbs and flowers, and with tapers on every pillar.” On the communion table stood “some plate, as a chalice, and candlesticks with wax candles.” What most impressed the visitor was Ferrar’s reverence in the church. “At the entering thereof he made a low obeisance ; a few paces further, a lower ; coming to the half-pace (which was at the east end, where the table stood) he bowed to the ground, if not prostrated himself,” giving afterwards as a reason that “God was more immediately present while we were worshipping Him in the Temple.”

Ferrar’s view of the peculiar position and tenets of the Church of England is indicated in the report preserved by his brother of the farewell discourse he addressed to the household at Gidding upon his death-bed :—

“Sunday [Nov. 5, 1637] he received the Communion which Mr. Groose administered, and before it made a most solemn and comfortable confession of his faith according to the Church of England, acknowledging his salvation to depend

* Mr. Shorthouse, who in his delightful romance of *John Inglesant* follows Lenton’s letter closely, does not notice this detail ; I should say he is justified in ignoring it, because the position of the table would have no controversial bearing. The point argued between the Roman and Anglican Churches at the time was not as to the fact of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but as to its nature, whether commemorative or repeated and substantial. The east window, with the picture of the crucifixion, which is made to play a part in influencing Inglesant, is imaginary. The only painted glass in the church was a representation of the royal arms.

only upon the sweet and infinite mercies and sufferings of his most dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, excluding all other dependencies, saying, 'when all men had done all they could, they must wholly acknowledge and confess themselves most unworthy servants.' So with great desire and devotion he received the Blessed Sacrament with much joy; and during all his sickness his speech tended to nothing but exhortations to love, fear, and serve God, as the only comfort and happiness of this world and [?] to the better. He often would exhort the family that 'they should steadfastly and constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Church of England, and to continue in the *good old way*, and in those they have been taught out of the Word of God, and in what he had accordingly informed them of, for it was the true, right, good way to heaven; that they should find oppositions and means used by those that they did not expect it from to withdraw them, to hinder, to divert them. But,' said he, 'I forewarn you to be constant, to be steadfast in the *good old way*. You will find danger and trouble, but shrink not, rely upon God, and serve Him in *sincerity of devotion, both in souls and bodies; God will have both, He made both, and both must worship Him in reverence and fear*. He is a great Lord God, as full of mercy, so of majesty. I am now going before Him, to give an account of what I have said to you and instructed you in. I again say, what I have taught you is according to His good will and heavenly Word, and out of it. Be you steadfast, and of good cheer; if you continue to serve Him, He will be your shield and defence to preserve you.' " *

May the words of the dying Ferrar find an echo in the hearts of all English Churchmen to-day!

* MAYOR'S *Ferrar*, p. 97.

XIV.

The Roman Controversy

BY W. E. COLLINS, M.A.

THE Roman controversy occupies a place which is shared by no other controversy whatever. It is always with us, and forces itself upon our notice from time to time whether we will or not. It is to be found in every part of the world where Romanism exists and is not in power. None are safe from it: the pretensions of the Roman See are no less destructive to the Eastern Churches than to those of the West. Its special claims and its methods are equally obnoxious to the Anglican Church and the Church of Constantinople; or, as they are sometimes described by the Roman authorities, the Anglican heresy and the Photian schism.* And the scholars of the Halkē at Constantinople† are as carefully trained to meet the attacks of Roman controversialists as are those of Trinity College Dublin. Nor is this by any means a phenomenon of recent days only. Even in the Middle Ages the exaggerated claims of the Roman Church had begun to provoke opposition. Although the best theological writers of that period willingly recognised that there were true Churches in the East which had never

* For example, in a letter addressed by the Congregation of the Inquisition to the Roman Catholic bishops in England (given by Cardinal MANNING *The Reunion of Christendom*, p. 98).

† The chief theological school of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

been subject to the Bishop of Rome, yet their dominant habit of thought lay in a contrary direction, and they frequently spoke and wrote as if the Catholic Church and the obedience of the Roman Pontiff were one and the same thing. Such a position called forth protests from the East, and led to inevitable recriminations. The Roman controversy had already begun: it has never really ceased since. The course of the religious movements of the sixteenth century was profoundly affected by the claims which were then being made on behalf of the Papacy. In the light of these claims the repudiation by the English Church of the usurped papal jurisdiction was regarded by "papists" or "Romanensians" as an act of schism. And the great Lutheran movement, instead of being received and tempered and modified within the bosom of the German Church, was turned into an alien channel largely owing to the same general causes. Nothing else has had so great an influence upon the general course of the history of the Church.

This unique character of the Roman controversy calls for explanation. It cannot be attributed solely to the imputations of false doctrine which have been levelled by other bodies against the Roman communion, and by it against other bodies. Doctrinal differences are common enough amongst Christians, and imputations of heresy are unhappily hardly less common. But things such as these pass away in course of time, and as the matters in debate are subjected to fresh study and to the evolution which comes with Christian experience. Were this all, there would be nothing to distinguish the Roman controversy from the many other controversies which have been agitated from time to time in Christendom, and which have at length died a natural death. This evidently would not account for all the facts; there must needs be some other explanation.

And the explanation is not far to seek: it lies in the very nature of Romanism itself. The Roman controversy is always with us, because Romanism is in perpetual conflict with every other Christian system; and Romanism comes into conflict with every other Christian system because it makes an exclusive claim upon the allegiance of the Christian world. The Roman communion claims to be the whole Catholic Church of Christ; its avowed object is to absorb and to include all else. And this claim is supported by another which has become more and more explicit with the course of time, viz. that the Roman Church is possessed of an organ which can speak with a direct and immediate authority, of such a nature that it overrules every other authority, in matters of faith and morals.*

It is this, then, which constitutes the importance of the Roman controversy, and which compels us from time to time to give our attention to it, however disinclined we may be to do so. Mere differences of opinion, even though they appear to be irreconcilable, do not in themselves involve controversy, and need not give rise to it. However strongly men hold to their individual beliefs, they can agree to differ, confident alike that in the end the truth is bound to prevail. No doubt those who hold strongly to their opinion or their religious belief, and desire to propagate it, must from time to time become involved in controversy; for anything in the nature of a public assertion upon disputed points is sure to call forth a protest upon the other side. Still, things such as these soon pass away. The actual points in dispute lose their interest after a time and give place to others; or at any

* The claim, of course, only reached its full growth in the constitution *Pastor aternus* which was put forth in the fourth session of the Vatican Council. It is given, for example, by Cardinal MANNING, *Petri Privilegium*, iii. pp. 204 f.

rate they cease to occupy a central place in men's thoughts. But a body the fundamental claim of which is its exclusiveness, which holds that outside itself there is no way of salvation, and which believes that all other religious societies are not truly that which they profess and believe themselves to be, can hardly shirk the responsibility of proclaiming the fact. It cannot refrain even though the result of its action is to brand with unreality, not to say falsehood, all claims which are contrary to its own. From the point of view of Romanism, it is a duty both of charity and of religion to assert its claims, just as it is the duty of all Christians to endeavour to bring heathens to the faith. But the result is inevitable too. The exclusive claim of the Roman communion to be the whole Catholic Church calls for, and indeed necessitates, an answer. It contains within itself not only the assertion that the rest of Christendom falls short of what it might be and ought to be, but also that it is not what it professes to be. Although, of course, it makes no such imputation upon anybody, it needs to be rebutted in precisely the same way as an attack upon a man's good name or a repudiation of his word of honour. Under these circumstances controversy is inevitable, since the only other alternative would be to allow the case to go by default. It cannot but continue until the claims in question have either been withdrawn or submitted to. Nor is this all. The sore is one which rankles; the contention is such that it is bound to rouse the spirit of opposition. And thus the controversy tends to become more and more embittered in the course of time, and gathers round itself an ever-growing accretion of charges and counter-charges which are only very indirectly connected with the original matter in dispute.

It will not be necessary to prove that the position of the Roman Catholic body towards all other religious

bodies is that which has been stated above, for the fact is sufficiently well known. It would be superfluous even to multiply instances in which this position has been formally affirmed. But one such case may be given here as having a special interest for us, and as showing how rigidly and uncompromisingly the Roman theory has been re-asserted in modern days. After the Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom had been condemned by the Roman Inquisition (late in 1865), Cardinal Manning published a pastoral letter on the subject, in which he summarised the condemnatory letters of the Holy Office as follows :

"1. That the unity of the Church is absolute and indivisible, and that the Church has never lost its unity, nor for so much as a moment of time ever can.

"2. That the Church of Christ is indefectible, not only in duration, but in doctrine ; or, in other words, that it is infallible, which is a Divine endowment bestowed upon it by its Head, and that the infallibility of the Church is a dogma of the faith.

"3. That the primacy of the Visible Head is of Divine institution, and was ordained to generate and to preserve the unity both of faith and of communion, that is, both internal and external, of which the See of Peter is the centre and the bond.

"4. That therefore the Catholic and Roman Church alone has received the name of Catholic.

"5. That no one can give to any other body the name of Catholic without incurring manifest heresy.

"6. That whosoever is separated from the one and only Catholic Church, howsoever well he may believe himself to live, by the one sin of separation from the unity of Christ is in the state of wrath.

"7. That every several soul, under pain of losing eternal life, is bound to enter the only Church of Christ, out of which is neither absolution nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven."*

* Cardinal MANNING, *The Reunion of Christendom*, p. 8 (quoted by E. S. PURCELL, *Life of Manning*, vol. ii. p. 285).

We should find it hard to exaggerate the claims which are advanced in this statement, and more especially in its latter clauses.* Obviously, if they have any basis of truth whatever, they entirely overthrow the claim of every other communion in Christendom to have any part in the Body of Christ, and indeed to be in any real sense Christian at all. On the other hand, if the claim be a baseless one, it is a most grievous affront upon the whole of Christendom, and one which, when translated into action by the founding of Roman Catholic "missions," calls for strenuous resistance.

It has been urged that after all there is no difference in kind between this position and that of the English Church. It is alleged that we unchurch all who have not episcopal orders, and that consequently the only difference between our action and that of the Roman communion is that we draw the line at different points. But the statement is not in accordance with the facts. For whatever isolated individuals may have said or done, the English Church has certainly passed no such judgment upon the members of any other body.† It has not even gone out of its way to judge the acts, or the corporate status, of any other body. It is none of our business to do anything of the sort; for the Catholic faith does not consist in negations. We may not indeed imperil our own gifts by dealing with those who have

* Mr. Purcell says, "It ought, perhaps, to be observed by way of explanation that the letter of the Holy Office does not apply to non-Catholics generally; but in a particular instance is addressed to a certain number of Anglican clergymen who, whilst professing belief in all the doctrines of the Catholic and Roman Church, hesitated or declined to become Catholics." But, even supposing that this description of the persons concerned were an accurate one, which it is not, that can have no bearing upon the claims which are here made. If they are true they need no justification; if otherwise, none will suffice.

† Archbishop Bramhall says that we "unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own Master" (*Works*, vol. iii. p. 517).

not received them as though they had received them. But for the rest, we take our stand upon the ground of the common Baptism, and "we unchurch none."*

In this respect the Roman position differs entirely from our own, and indeed from that of practically every other Christian body. There are other Christian bodies, no doubt, which regard some parts of Christendom as being grievously infected with heresy, or even, it may be, as apostate Churches. But only the Roman body claims to be the whole Catholic Church of Christ and denies that any other body is part of that Church.† By so doing it has inevitably taken up a position of isolation, and indeed of antagonism, towards all the rest of Christendom. We may ignore it or minimise it, but the fact is there, and its consequences are unmistakable. As the direct result of its own act, the Roman communion stands alone, sharply divided from all else.

This line of cleavage is not an imaginary one: it is very real, and witness is borne to it on many sides. For example, Anglicans often find themselves compelled to repudiate the popular misuse of language which divides Christians into two classes, Catholics and Protestants; by which names are meant members of the Roman communion and other Christians. Popular language, however, though frequently inaccurate, is always significant. It is so in this case. The Roman communion claims an unique position in Christendom; and by that very fact it has obtained an unique position. But it is no enviable one.

* HOOKER, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book III. chap. i. § II: "We must acknowledge even heretics themselves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church."

† The Easterns always recognise that their Churches do not constitute the whole Church of Christ. See for example the *Answer of the Greek Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Unity*, of which an excellent edition, with an English translation, was issued by the Archimandrite E. Metallinos, of the Greek Church of the Annunciation at Manchester.

"In claiming (as in fact she does claim) to be the whole, she has taken up a position which is essentially schismatic : for that is essentially schismatic which makes for a part the claim of the whole."* As between the Roman communion and the rest of Christendom, therefore, it is the former which might accurately be said to occupy the first "protestant" position. This cannot but call forth a counter-protest, and those who make it may not inaptly be called "protestants" too, just as in the seventeenth century there were Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants. But it must be borne in mind that when the word is used in this sense it covers not only the non-episcopal bodies of the West, not only the Churches of the Anglican communion, but also the Churches of the Orthodox East.

Such is the Roman controversy in its essential form. But as it concerns any particular non-Roman body there are always other elements present. For about this central dispute, which concerns the whole of Christendom, and at all times (that is, since Rome first put forward this claim that communion with it is essential to membership of the Church), there has gathered an endless swarm of other questions : questions of doctrine and polity and worship. Some are of greater importance, some of less ; but all are very keenly realised at the time by the particular body concerned. Some of them are questions upon which the rest of Christendom is united in repudiating the Roman doctrine ; others have to do with doctrinal peculiarities of particular bodies, which would be unhesitatingly rejected as heretical by the Church as a whole ; in some the very existence of a corporate Life is involved. But however important they may be, and however keenly particular doctrinal or practical questions may be discussed at particular times, they are accidental to the Roman controversy and not of its very essence. Obstacles to reunion or

* C. GORE, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 6, first edition.

intercommunion they may be, but not therefore grounds of controversy. From this particular point of view (the limitation must of course be carefully noted) questions of doctrine, even vital doctrine, are of less importance than the central fact which has already been dwelt upon.

That this is really the case is clear. (*a*) In the first place, we must bear in mind that, as it has been pointed out above, controversy will die away of its own accord unless there be something to keep it open. But differences of doctrine, however important, come to be recognised and accepted, after a time, as facts of history and experience; and this without any necessary loss of earnestness on either side. If the controversy is to continue, there must be some constant stimulus or irritant to produce the effect: an ever-present hostile claim, or an argument of the nature of a *praescriptio*, such as we have seen to exist in the present case. (*b*) Again, the particular points of doctrine, or worship, or practice, which seem all-important to the men of one particular age, are frequently found to have lost a large measure of their importance after a lapse of time. Experience shows that whilst the faith itself remains unaltered, the content of popular doctrine is constantly changing; and the theological writings of any particular age will generally be found very unsatisfying by the men of another age.* Some elements seem to have lost their value altogether; others occupied a place in their own day which, to those who come after, seems out of all proportion to their real significance. The explanation of all this is simple enough. As Dr. Salmon has said, the theologians of every age have sought to combine "the doctrines which they learned from revelation with the results of what they regarded as the best philosophy of their own

* That is, if they are used as being complete in themselves. They are most valuable, of course, as a means of delivering us from the partial theology of our own age.

day, so as to obtain what seemed to them the most satisfactory account and explanation of the facts of the universe. Every union of philosophy and religion is the marriage of a mortal with an immortal; the religion lives; the philosophy grows old and dies. When the philosophic element of a theological system becomes antiquated, its explanations which contented one age become unsatisfactory to the next, and there ensues what is spoken of as a conflict between religion and science; whereas, in reality, it is a conflict between the science of one generation and that of the succeeding generation."*

I have quoted the whole passage because of its inherent value: but it is the earlier part with which we are more particularly concerned. As then this philosophical element passes out of men's minds, many questions which once seemed all-important sink into the background; and men begin to find that, whilst they differed profoundly in their standpoint and their presuppositions, their divergence as to the substance of the faith was often more superficial than it at first appeared. New questions and new difficulties may doubtless arise, but as a rule (although to this there are exceptions) they have little of the terrible gravity of the old ones. (c) And once more, we are learning to realise that doctrinal differences are not so valid a cause for separation as they were once held to be. In part, it may be, this comes from a certain indifference to belief which is rather a sad feature of our age, and a tendency to regard all beliefs as merely tentative hypotheses. But in the main it is the result of causes far nobler. It springs from a larger reverence for the beliefs and the opinions of other men as such, and a renewed sense of personal responsibility which results from this. Nowadays we are beginning to feel that, precisely because conviction is such a sacred thing, we are responsible for our own beliefs and not for those of other people. Under such circumstances controversy loses much of its bitterness

* *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, art. "Gnosticism," vol. ii. p. 678.

and tends to die away. We even realise that it does not follow that, although we differ gravely from them upon particular questions, we should refuse to communicate with others who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, and have submitted to the ordinances which He has appointed.*

Under the influence of causes such as these, the subsidiary features of Roman controversy have been undergoing a constant change. (*a*) Although questions of doctrine have always had a large place in it, there is little fixity as to the particular doctrinal questions involved. Now one point is insisted upon and now another; and this is the case on both sides. In some respects, at any rate, the two positions are distinctly nearer together than they once were; that is, in matters of doctrine unconnected with the papal claims. (*b*) And there has been a constant tendency for doctrinal questions to be set upon one side and for historical questions to take the first place. It would be idle to illustrate this in detail, but an examination of the controversial writings on both sides at different periods will at once make it clear. To give a single illustration: the doctrinal position taken up by English Churchmen at the beginning of this century differs not a little from that which would be taken up by an English Churchman of the present day; and the doctrinal position taken up by those whom Cardinal Manning used to call "Old Catholics"† differed at least as much, if not more, from that which would be taken up by their modern successors. And this is but a particular instance of a change which has been going on elsewhere, and over a much longer period. But the fundamental controversy yet remains, and must remain until the uncatholic claims of the Papacy are given up.

* As it was realised of old: see Archbishop BENSON, *Cyprian*, p. 334.

† See, for example, E. S. PURCELL, *Life of Manning*, vol ii. p. 99, etc.

So far we have been dealing with the Roman controversy in general, or as it concerns any "protestant" against the pretensions and the usurped authority of the Papacy. We must now deal with it more particularly, and as it concerns us Anglicans.

Surely no faithful member of the English Church ought to be without a deep and personal sense of reverent gratitude towards the Church of Rome. To others it may represent the resting-place of Apostles, the Church of saints martyred in persecution, the most august Church of the West, the champion of tottering Christendom against the forces of barbarism: to us it is all this and more. We look to Rome as our mother-Church, just as the Churches of Lyons and Vienne looked to Asia Minor, and the Church of Germany to England; for under no stress of controversy can we ever forget "the peace which St. Gregory sent us through the Bishop Augustine."* It was he who first launched the English Church, which has drawn into itself the pre-existing Christianity of Britain, and has in turn become a fruitful mother of Churches.

But we cannot therefore allow ourselves to turn aside from the facts. The Church to which we had owed so much in the past remained in relations of close fellowship with us, and it was harder for us to guard against encroachments than it was for others. And so in Bramhall's words, "The Pope winded himself into England by degrees,"† and tyrannised over us as he did over other Churches. The tyranny prevails to this day in Spain and France; and in fact so thoroughly has it done its work that people would seem almost to have forgotten that there is such a thing as the Church of Spain or the Church of France. Popular language includes them both

* *English Chronicle*, s. a. 785.

† *Works*, vol. i. p. 131.

under the title "the Roman Church" or "the Roman Catholic Church," or the like. And it is not much to be wondered at, for they have almost ceased to preserve even the memory of their former majestic greatness and their ancient rights. Romanism has changed all that.

We however have been blessed with a happier lot, and were at length able to throw off the usurped authority, and to set our house in order to the best of our ability. The work was done at a time of great upheaval and confusion, when zeal was greater than knowledge or discretion, and men's passions ran high. We have never claimed that the work was done perfectly, but it was done without wrecking our own Church, and without in any way renouncing the communion of the Roman Church or any other. This we have never done from that day to the present. With much to blame ourselves for, with much that was left undone and much that was done amiss, with many faults of temper, and impatience, and irreligion, and many mistakes and blunders which we have been trying since to retrieve, we have at least broken communion with none and placed no new obstacles to communion in the way of any.

It was they that made the breach, not we. Already there were those who argued that by abolishing the papal authority we had unchurched ourselves, but for years no formal severance of communion took place. In fact, when at length it came, it was not the direct outcome of a religious dispute, but the result of a spiteful misuse of ecclesiastical power for political purposes. Early in 1570 Pope Pius V declared Elizabeth to be deposed, and excommunicated both the Queen herself and all her subjects who should continue to be loyal to her. And so, by this strange medley of temporal and ecclesiastical action, which was received with dismay on the

Continent,* the Papacy broke off communion with the English Church. And thus things have remained ever since. From that time to this, according to Roman principles, we have ceased to be part of the Catholic Church, by virtue of the fact that we are out of communion with the Papacy.

To such a monstrously uncatholic position we can make no reply but to repudiate it vigorously and to cleave the more steadfastly to those who hold it. The claim itself, with all that it involves, is so arrogant that the severe words of the great Bishop Butler as to "that great corruption of Christianity" are not a whit too severe :

"Whoever will consider the popish claims, to the disposal of the whole earth, as of Divine right, to dispense with the most sacred engagements, the claims to supreme absolute authority in religion ; in short, the general claims which the canonists express by the words *plenitude of power*—whoever, I say, will consider popery as it is professed at Rome, may see that it is manifest, open usurpation of all human and divine authority."†

And yet we may not forget our duty towards those with whom we are united by their and our fellowship in the Catholic Church. They may renounce us, but we may not and do not renounce them. We can use the words of St. Optatus of old with regard to the Donatists :

"Although the Donatists themselves do not deny, and it is known to all men, that they hate us, and abhor us, and will not be called our brethren, yet we cannot depart from the fear of God: . . . without doubt, therefore, they are our brethren, though

* See R. SIMPSON, *Life of Campion*, p. 88 f. Philip of Spain wrote to his ambassador in England, Don Guerau de Spes, "His Holiness has taken this step without communicating with me in any way, which certainly has greatly surprised me, because my knowledge of English affairs is such that I believe I could give a better opinion upon them, and the course that ought to have been adopted under the circumstances, than anybody else." *Calendar of Spanish Papers*, Eliz., vol. ii. p. 254.

† *Sermon before the House of Lords*, June 11th, 1747. (BUTLER, *Works*, vol. ii. p. 366 f., ed. W. E. Gladstone.)

not good brethren. Let nobody, therefore, wonder that I call them brethren, for they cannot become other than brethren. For we and they have one spiritual birth, although our actions differ.”*

And as he adds afterwards :

“Ye cannot but be our brethren whom one Mother, the Church, hath borne from her own womb in the sacraments ; whom in like manner God, our Father, hath received as His sons by adoption. . . . We all pray, ‘Our Father which art in heaven’ : whence we may perceive that we are not totally separated from one another, seeing that we pray for you willingly, and you pray for us even though against your will.”†

Such then is our position with regard to the Roman communion. The primary question between us is one of history and polity rather than one of theology in the strict sense of the word. It is true that the theological differences between us and Roman Catholics are both many and grave. We should be unfaithful to God’s guidance to us hitherto, unfaithful to the Truth Himself, if we even pretended to ignore them. And although all honest study of views of truth other than our own is deserving of a hearty commendation, the same thing can hardly be said of the practice, which is followed by a certain number of English students who are more inquiring than wise, of referring to mere school or seminary textbooks of Roman theology, accepting their statements as if they had behind them the authority of the Catholic Church, and attempting, with very indifferent success, to assimilate and adopt their laboured phraseology. For although many of the treatises written on theological and kindred subjects by Roman Catholic scholars of to-day are of the greatest value, so that they have laid the whole world of learning under the deepest obligations, this certainly cannot be said of the ordinary Roman theological

* S. OPTATUS *de Schism. Donatist.* lib. i. c. 3.

† *ib.* lib. iv. c. 2.

text-books. Not to speak of the things which an Anglican believes to be actually erroneous in doctrine, or knows to be untrue in fact, the words of Rosmini, with regard to the "text-books used in seminaries" in his day, are still by no means inapplicable :

"These books I believe will in the more hopeful days of the imperishable Church be considered to be the most meagre and feeble works that have been written during the eighteen centuries of her history. They are books without life, without principles, without eloquence and without system ; although by a set and regular arrangement of materials which takes the place of system, they show that the authors have exhausted their intellectual resources. They are the product neither of feeling, nor talent, nor imagination ; they are not episcopal or priestly, but in every sense secular ; they require only masters able to read mechanically and pupils who can listen as mechanically."*

Nevertheless it must be repeated that at the present day theological differences have but a very secondary place amongst the difficulties which stand in the way of a restoration of the broken communion. So far as we are concerned, the English Church does not impose any theological test upon those who desire to communicate at her altars. And so far as they are concerned, it is not doctrine but submission to the Papacy which is regarded as the essential thing, without which all else goes for nothing. This is "the one great debt," and "the first absolute vital principle."†

But unfortunately we are not concerned only with the Churches of the Roman obedience, or even with the claims of the Papacy. The Roman controversy derives its gravest character, so far as we are involved in it, from the fact that there is in our midst a body which aims at undermining

* A. ROSMINI, *The Five Wounds of the Church*, Eng. trans., pp. 66-7.

† Manning to Robert Wilberforce, March 6th, 1852 (E. S. PURCELL, *Life of Manning*, ii. 28).

and destroying the English Church. From the Roman Catholic point of view this was no doubt inevitable. If the Church had been extinguished in England it was a praiseworthy act, indeed an obvious duty, to endeavour once more to plant the Catholic faith amongst us. And however much we regret their action, we cannot but respect and admire the zeal of those who were willing to run the risk of incurring the penalties of high treason in their eagerness to carry out their mission. Nor did their zeal prove fruitless. They gathered together and confirmed in their separation a large number of English Churchmen who stood apart on account of their papist sympathies, and added to them not a few who had previously conformed. In this way they deterred many from falling into line with the English Church, as otherwise they would probably have done sooner or later. And the result is that there still exists amongst us a hostile body having those of our own household as its nucleus. About this nucleus others have gathered, especially immigrants from Ireland, and a considerable proportion of the naturalised aliens who have done so much to make their adopted fatherland great. Gradually developing in organisation and numbers, this body has at length, within the last fifty years, received a hierarchy from Rome, and stands before the world as a fully organised "Church."

Now whatever may be said with regard to such a body as this, it is at least clear that it cannot claim to be, or to represent, the historic Church of England. The marks of its modern origin and character stand out plainly. In no single respect does it preserve or reproduce any of the characteristic features of English Churchmanship, or indeed anything at all but what is modern and Roman. In its origin, it is a revolt from the English Church of individuals who were unable to move with that Church.

In its completion, it is a creation of the Papacy of to-day. Such is the acknowledgment which has been made by its own leaders :

"The Catholic Church [in England] was extinguished when Elizabeth destroyed the Hierarchy. The religion survived, and a number of priests, but the Church was gone. It was long without a Bishop. Then it had a Vicar-Apostolic for England and Scotland; then for long years no Bishop at all. Then a Vicar-Apostolic or two, then four, and in this century eight; then at last the Hierarchy of Pius IX. From that Michaelmas Day 1850 dates the Catholic Church in England, after three hundred years of ruin."*

Needless to say, we hold, and always have held, that the Catholic Church was not extinguished in England in the reign of Elizabeth or at any other time, and that it is here to this day. Whether desirable in themselves or not, we hold that neither any single one of the changes which were made at the Reformation, nor the whole of them taken together, can have destroyed it. We know well that, whatever actual objections may be made against us from time to time, "the very head and front of our offending" is our abolition of the usurped authority of the Papacy. That we did in order to be more faithful to our Catholic position. So far as this was concerned, we were only abolishing what was not really Catholic at all, and thereby coming into line with the Churches of the East.

It does not fall within the scope of this essay to illustrate the position of the English Church, in this respect, in detail, or to defend *seriatim* the actual changes that were made. To do so would require a volume rather than a single essay. It must suffice to point out what has been our contention from the first, from which we have never wavered. We have never relinquished our Catholic position.

* Cardinal Manning's "Autobiographical Notes" (E. S. PURCELL, *Life of Manning*, vol. ii. p. 773).

Parker describes his Church as "the Catholic Church of England"* at the very period referred to, and it is constantly called so at later dates. Dean Hickes contrasts a "Roman Catholic" with a "Church-of-England Catholic" towards the end of the seventeenth century.† To mention only one instance more, Bishop Phillpotts made the same distinction in the early part of this century:

"The phrase *Roman Catholics* may be tolerated, both as recognising the distinction of particular branches, and as especially distinguishing members of the Roman branch of the Catholic Church; just as *English Catholics* might be a fit denomination, if it were necessary to adopt it, of members of the Church of England."‡

Therefore, if our position has any reality whatever, the ground is cut away from beneath the Roman Catholic body in England. Although this body is in subjection to the Papacy, and therefore in communion with Roman Christendom, the English Church is obviously unable to regard it as we are glad to regard the continental Churches of the West. It is a body the very existence of which is an affront, the very object of which is to proselytise the sons and daughters of our Church. Our misfortunes constitute its opportunities. It has been credibly accused before now of rejoicing when all is not well with us;§ and judging from the tone of certain Roman Catholic papers in England, and the large amount of their space which is devoted to some aspects of our

* STRYPE, *Life of Parker*, App. p. 134 (folio edition).

† HICKES, *Vindication of the Church of England* (in GIBSON, *Preservative from Popery*, ed. Cumming, vol. ii. p. 74).

‡ Bishop PHILLPOTTS, *Letters to Charles Butler*, p. 8. I quote from the edition of 1866, but the Letters were first published in 1825.

§ "Let us consider how the *Romanists* triumph in our quarrels, and how active and industrious they are in fomenting our differences, and adding fuel to our flames. When the kingdom of *Israel* was divided by the revolt of *Jeroboam*, then was the time of *Shishak*, the King of Egypt, to forage the Land, and take away the treasures of the Temple of the Lord." WILLIAM JANE, *Sermon preached before the House of Commons*, April 11th, 1679.

affairs, there is much to suggest that this is still the case. From their own point of view this is natural enough, and not altogether unpraiseworthy. But it is plain that a sect which exists for the simple purpose of compassing the overthrow of the English Church can hardly claim any recognition at our hands. It is a standing menace to us, and its very existence provokes controversy, and renders it necessary.*

And in fact it has always been held that the Roman Catholic body in England stands in a position entirely different from that of the Churches of the Roman obedience. The latter are amongst those Churches which the English Church had no purpose to forsake or reject, only departing from them "in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the apostolical Churches which were their first founders."† But the Roman Catholics in England are, in the eyes of the English Church, nothing but one of the bodies of Dissenters which (largely, alas! through the fault of the Church itself) have departed from our communion. So they are spoken of again and again. Dr. John Cockburn, for example, who preached a funeral sermon for Bishop Compton of London, speaks of his teaching as follows:

"And as this good Bishop had a true zeal against the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, so he distinguish'd judiciously betwixt the Innovations and Corruptions of that Church, and the Remains of pure and primitive Antiquity which were to be found there. He did not as some suffer an aversion to Popery to run into Fanaticism, and to beget a dislike of all Antiquity,

* Mr. Gladstone wrote to Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle in 1875: "I am one of those who think that in view of the Roman Propaganda in this country there ought to be a much more constant controversial action, especially as a defensive one, on the Anglican side." (E. S. PURCELL and E. DE LISLE, *Life of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle*, vol. ii. p. 47.) Unfortunately the need has not diminished since.

† Canons of 1604, No. xxx.

Order, Decency, and well composed Forms, which as experience shows can only secure against Innovations and preserve the Purity of Faith and Worship. And therefore as became a wise and good man, he withstood all other Dissenters as well as Papists.”*

The printed account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, as circulated in the early years of the Society,† classes English “Romanists” amongst “Dissenters” in precisely the same way; and other instances of this classification might easily be given. In fact, in their petition to Parliament, made in 1791, they actually described themselves as “Protesting Catholic Dissenters,” and were prepared to take an oath in which they called themselves by the same title.‡ As Henry Phillpotts subsequently wrote to Charles Butler:

“The law of the land gave you and your religion a very different name till the year 1791, when, for the first time, it called you Roman-Catholics. Nay, so little was your exclusive assumption of the title of Catholics then admitted, that you were afraid of so calling yourselves in your petition to parliament, lest your petition should on that account be refused admission. You therefore were designated by your own committee as ‘Protesting Catholic Dissenters.’”§

In fact, at a comparatively recent period Roman Catholics of English birth received an inferior treatment at the hands of the law to that which was meted out to foreign Roman Catholics. In 1804 a law was passed|| which, amongst other things, enabled the king to grant all military commissions whatsoever to foreign Roman Catholics. Three years afterwards a measure was proposed to enable him to grant the like commissions to

* JOHN COCKBURN, *The Blessedness of Christians After Death, etc.*, p. 19.

† That which I possess is for 1703.

‡ See A. J. C. ALLEN, *Protestation of the English Romanists*, p. 36; and W. J. AMHERST, *History of Catholic Emancipation*, vol. i. pp. 166-7.

§ Bishop PHILLPOTTS, *Letters to Charles Butler*, p. 7.

|| 44 Geo. III. cap. 75.

all Roman Catholics of English birth who should take an oath disclaiming certain civil tenets which were imputed to them. It was strenuously opposed, and ultimately withdrawn by Lord Howick, who had introduced it.* And the happy withdrawal of civil disabilities from this body at a yet later date has not in any way lessened the necessity that we should protect ourselves against its inroads.

It is the existence of this hostile body which above all compels the English Church to be on her guard. Otherwise our attitude is one of friendship and amity towards all Christendom. As regards those who differ from us, we can wait confidently; ready to learn ourselves, and trusting that others may. As regards a body which aims at annihilating us, we are bound to be circumspect. Even here, however, our position is not one of active hostility. We have no hostile propaganda, and the motto of the English Church might well be "Defence, not Defiance." The former is necessary because we have to deal with a system which attracts superficial observers by its apparent simplicity. It is this which constitutes its appeal to men in times of difficulty; and "That religion," as Mr. Gladstone once said,† "has the most extraordinary fascination for men and women in their hours of weakness." It behoves us therefore to be on our guard. But "defiance" is unnecessary because, strong in the consciousness of what God has done for us in the past, we are able with all confidence to trust ourselves to His protection for the future.

* HANSARD, *Debates*, vol. viii. col. 1073, and vol. ix. cols. 2, 150, etc. See also Dr. JOHN LINGARD, *Remarks on a Charge . . . by Shute, Bishop of Durham*, p. 16 n. (Dublin, 1828).

† To the present Lord Northbourne, from whom I heard it.

Uniformity.

By W. E. COLLINS, M.A.

WITHIN comparatively recent times a great change has come over our conception of the universe of which we form a part. It is not so very long since, as it has been said, uniformity had come to be the dominant category of thought. Logic was conceived of as being based upon the law of uniformity; and an argument in favour of certain *a priori* views of nature was derived from the so-called "uniformity of nature." But

"that phrase, of shallow meaning and questionable value (seeing that no two things in nature were ever exactly alike), has now, to a great extent, lost its vogue. There was an undue simplicity about it, which has been considerably modified by the subsequent progress of science. For our increase of scientific knowledge has also increased our scientific agnosticism, by widening the horizon of what remains to be known; and men are becoming far more ready to recognise that 'there are far more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy.' And we now think less of the uniformity than of the unity of nature, that unity which the very word 'universe' implies; the ultimate correlation between the whole and its parts, between the parts and their whole."*

A change not altogether dissimilar in kind has gradually

* ILLINGWORTH, *Divine Immanence*, pp. 102-3.

been passing over our spiritual conceptions. We are learning to think less of uniformity and more of unity; or rather, to put it more accurately, we are learning to realise that unity and uniformity are different in kind, and that the former is far greater than the latter. Uniformity may have a purpose of its own, but no amount of uniformity can ever secure unity. The difference between the two has been well stated by one of our greatest teachers :

“Uniformity is the natural consequence of a limited design : unity is the outward expression of one great principle embodied in many ways. The one comes from without, the other from within : the one is the sign of constraint, the other of freedom : the one answers, in its highest shape, to organisation, the other to growth.”*

And thus we have all begun to recognise that any unity which is worthy of the name must go far deeper than many of the theories and much of the practice of the past was willing to allow. For it cannot be denied that much of the zeal of former days on behalf of unity was really directed towards the attainment of a merely outward unity, and that in effect it often only accentuated the differences which already existed.

It is surely unnecessary to multiply examples in illustration of this fact ; human history is full of them, and the history of the Church is by no means an exception. Differentiation is the usual line of development in spiritual as in natural things ; and differentiation, as it increases, is always apt to obscure the underlying harmony. Moreover, a marred or imperfect development produces friction within the body, and must sooner or later lead to actual disunion. And when men have become conscious of disunion, or fancied that it exists, they have frequently resorted to force to put an end to it : thus endeavouring to bring about outward agreement by means which could

* Bishop WESTCOTT, *The Bible in the Church*, p. 12.

never produce conviction. The Church on earth, which runs its course subject to the infirmities and the passions which compass human nature, has often been drawn into adopting the same method of action ; and this in spite of the fact that such compulsion is contrary to the whole spirit of Christianity, which demands conviction and not only outward agreement. The case has been well stated thus :

“It is natural for any human society to wish for order, and to find order in uniformity. The massive organisation of the Roman State had tried to crush Christianity, because it claimed an independent existence ; when Christianity could not be crushed it was adopted. It is ever so : the State must accept any power that exists, and must use it for its own purposes. Uniformity of religious belief was ruled by the State to be necessary, and was enforced accordingly. This was contradictory to the spirit of the Church, and was long felt to be so. Yet the Church gave way to the supposed necessities of its new position. Paganism was forbidden ; heretics were reduced to obedience by the strong arm of the law.”*

Nor was this temper, which laid all stress upon outward unity, directed only towards the attainment of uniformity of belief ; it also aimed (more particularly, as we shall see, in and after the sixteenth century) at the attainment of what is with more strict accuracy described as uniformity, viz., uniformity of public worship. We may take an instance from our own history. To the age of Elizabeth, uniformity of public worship was an end in itself ; and diversity was a positive evil, and a prolific source of other evils. In a well-known letter to Archbishop Parker, the Queen declares that “diversity, variety, contention, and vain love of singularity, either in our ministers or in the people, must needs provoke the displeasure of Almighty God, and be to us, having the burden of government,

* Bishop CREIGHTON, *Persecution and Tolerance*, p. 73.

discomfortable, heavy, and troublesome ; and finally must needs bring danger of ruin to our people and country." This being so, Elizabeth goes on to say :

"We, considering the authority given to us of Almighty God for defence of the public peace, concord, and truth of this His Church, and how we are answerable for the same to the seat of His high justice, mean not to endure or suffer any longer these evils to proceed, spread, and increase in our realm, but have certainly determined to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties amongst them of the clergy and our people as breed nothing but contention, offence, and breach of common charity, and are also against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of our realm, to be reformed and repressed and brought to one manner of uniformity through our whole realm and dominions, that our people may thereby quietly honour and serve Almighty God in truth, concord, peace, and quietness, and thereby also avoid the slanders that are spread abroad here-upon in foreign countries."*

Here diversity is spoken of as an evil in itself, and so displeasing to Almighty God ; and uniformity, if not actually an end in itself, is so highly to be desired that it is a good thing to bring it about by whatever means.

It is true that this spirit is by no means a thing entirely of the past ; but at any rate the dominant tendency of the present day runs in a contrary direction. We have come to see that in the spiritual relationships of men, as in nature, unity does not depend upon outward resemblance, or upon the doing of similar things, but upon the sharing of a common life ; and that variety may be the natural way, indeed the only way, in which a many-sided life can find an adequate expression. This being so, outward conformity can have no value as a measure of unity unless it be the expression and the symbol of an inward temper : it may even be an obstacle to true unity, rather than a

* Elizabeth to Parker, 25th January, 1564-5 (*Parker Correspondence*, p. 224 f.).

means of bringing it about. This fact has taken a strong hold upon our minds at the present day. And on this account there is amongst us a strong tendency to look with suspicion upon all efforts after uniformity, and to regard them as unjustifiable encroachments upon individual liberty. Uniformity and Acts of Uniformity are alike distasteful to an age which is striving after a fuller self-expression.

But this is surely a mistake in the opposite direction : as is often the case with us, the reaction has gone too far. In the past, uniformity may have been unduly pushed forward, until it had quite outgrown its proper sphere. But it has a proper sphere of its own, and that no unimportant one. It may not be an end in itself, but it is a most important and indispensable means to an end. It is in fact an element which, however much we may try to ignore it, can never be eliminated from the common life of rational beings.

We proceed, then, to ask the question, What is the proper function of uniformity? When is it in place, and when out of place, in the affairs of common life? Briefly, it may be answered that uniformity serves a twofold purpose. It is, in the first place, a precedent condition of all common action. And secondly, it is the bulwark by which such common action is protected against the encroachments of isolated self-assertion ; it is, in other words, a defence for the society against the arbitrary tyranny of the individual.

I. It is a precedent condition of all common action. In reality this is self-evident, and follows from the very nature of common action. Individual action is free, and the individual can do as he pleases within the limitations of the natural forces by which he is surrounded. But the same thing is not true of common action. Common action

implies co-operation ; for two cannot walk together except they be agreed. It implies the acceptance by individuals of certain limitations with a view to supplementing one another's activities ; and this is only possible when men are willing to act according to some plan which is at all events taken for granted beforehand.

Moreover, when this common action is that of a body, the scheme must be that of the body and not merely of its individual members. It belongs to the society, not to the individual, to determine the conditions of this common action ; in a word, there must be something of the nature of uniformity imposed from without. Of course the society may be unwise in the uniformity which it enforces and in the limitations which it imposes upon its members : all positive human law consists of what may be described as acts of uniformity, and nobody would be so bold as to say that human laws have always been wise. Uniformity may be enforced in unsuitable ways or by unsuitable methods ; or the endeavour may be made to do by common action what might better have been left to individual effort. In such cases it has obviously become tiresome and harmful. But the fact remains that uniformity has its place in human life, and that, in some degree at any rate, it is inseparable from common action. If indeed it be the case that our lives attain their highest value conjointly and not individually, we may go further and say that uniformity is an essential means to the fulfilment of the highest kind of human action. And if we are "the Body of Christ, and members in particular," uniformity can claim its place as one of the laws of action of the Body.

2. Nor can it be said that uniformity is an encroachment upon individual liberty ; rightly understood, it is rather a restraint upon individual licence. For although a man's thoughts may be said to be his own, yet as soon

as they bear fruit in action they cease to be so. For strictly speaking there is no such thing as a private action : everything that a man does affects others outside himself. And thus every action really belongs to society at large and not merely to the individual agent. Individual liberty does not include the right of the individual to act as he pleases, quite irrespective of the results of his action upon others.* Consequently, uniformity is a bulwark to protect the rights of the society, not an encroachment upon those of the individual. Its functions may be compared with those of a Creed. A Creed, rightly understood, is not of the nature of a prison but of a fortress ; its object is to preserve the largeness of the Faith, not to confine it within limits or to tie it down in any way, but rather to guard it against encroachments from without, on one side or the other.† Measures of uniformity have a like purpose. Their function is not to limit the activities of the society, but to provide a free scope for their exercise ; not to encroach upon private liberties, but to protect the society from the arbitrary tyranny of the individual.

And this leads to a very definite conclusion as to the proper scope of uniformity : it should be concerned with external actions and not with mental dispositions. A man's thoughts are his own in a way in which his acts can never be ; other men can only be concerned with them as they issue in action, for so only can other men become

* Cf. RITCHIE, *Natural Rights*, chap. VII.

† MACCOLL, *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, p. 4 : "It is a mistake to suppose that the Nicene Creed (and the observation applies to the other Creeds) was intended to narrow the basis of the Church. . . . It was the heterodox parties that commenced the war of limitations, and sought by definitions to narrow the Church of Christ ; whereas the orthodox party merely swept away these definitions, and fenced the field of faith with counter-definitions to mark and protect its boundaries. Examine every heresy known to history, and you will find in every case that it has tried to narrow the field of belief, to cut off something from the common stock, to contract the circle of the Christian Faith."

aware of them. Uniformity of belief, in any real sense of the word, is therefore a thing which can never be imposed from without ; and the attempts which have been made to impose it constitute one of the saddest and most instructive chapters in the world's history. Moreover, no real loss of freedom is involved in submitting our action to the guidance of other men ; whilst it is a thing degrading in itself to take our opinions at second hand from other men. For it is not only an axiom of religion but a fact of experience that we liberate our wills and make them our own by resolute submission to the conditions of our life, and willing obedience to such regulations of conduct as may be imposed by the body of which we are part. Obedience to the law is honourable, and the more so when the law is irksome ; and although the ultimate rights of conscience (*viz.*, to disobey and take the consequences) are on all hands recognised, yet we are rightly jealous of that over-scrupulousness about trifles which is always too ready to pose under the august name of principle. On the other hand, religion and experience alike teach us to resist the tendency to put mere formulas in the place of a vital apprehension of the truths which are expressed by those formulas. Although the fault is a very common one, it is on all hands recognised that there is something degrading in the idea of taking our thoughts or our opinions at second hand, whether at the bidding of a newspaper, or a party, or any other would-be infallible oracle. From the very constitution of our being it follows that our opinions must be drawn from sources outside ourselves ; but they are not really ours at all, and have no real value of any kind, excepting in so far as we have "made them our own."

From considerations such as these it follows that the proper sphere of measures of uniformity is external, not internal. Uniformity can link men together into a solid

phalanx for the purposes of common action, but can never really make them one in respect of opinion or belief. As regards the latter, it can offer no sanction such as the conscience ought to accept. It may commend, but it cannot command; no amount of external authority can make it right for a man to accept as true that which he does not believe to be true. As regards the former, it appeals to the conscience with the greatest possible force. No doubt the voice of conscience is still supreme, but only a man with a very ill-regulated or ill-informed conscience will consider his actions from his own individual point of view. Actions which were previously in their nature indifferent acquire a moral sanction when they are enjoined by the authority of the society.* Individual preferences and individual judgments may be, and ought to be, laid aside before such an authority as this. In fact it is only the recognition of this plain duty of obedience to the law of the society, as defined by its constituted authorities, which makes corporate life possible at all. It may still be a man's duty to disobey, but it can only be so in obedience to an authority yet higher, an authority so great that its claims justify him in a course of action which, so far as it goes, strikes at the very root of all corporate life. He is bound to obey, in other words, unless he is bound to disobey; and if the latter be his duty, then he will disobey with sorrow and humiliation, not with the jaunty self-conceit which rejoices in having its own way.

Measures of uniformity, then, should have reference to matters of conduct, and not to matters of opinion. But

* Compare the statement of Archbishop Parker, in the latest letter of his which we possess, written just a month before his death: "Does your lordship think that I care either for cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread, or any such? But for the laws so established I esteem them." (Parker to Burleigh, Apr. 11th, 1575.)—*Parker Correspondence*, p. 478. We learn from this letter that Parker's action earned for him the reputation of a "great papist" in his own day.

although this is the case it is important to remember that the line of least resistance, that line which human weakness naturally prefers, leads in precisely the opposite direction. There is a natural tendency for men to be unduly dependent upon others in matters of belief, and self-willed in matters of action. To adopt the opinions of other people at second hand, instead of honestly endeavouring to form opinions of our own, is a course which avoids much effort and much anxiety, though at the cost of all that most dignifies human life. On the other hand, to give up at the bidding of others the line of action which we ourselves should have chosen is always irksome. It touches us just at the point where we are most susceptible, and wounds our pride by the very littleness of the demands which it makes upon our self-surrender. In both of these respects, therefore, human weakness and wilfulness makes its protest. So far as outward appearances go it protests against uniformity itself, whereas in reality it is often merely protesting against one kind of uniformity, and striving to substitute another for it which would be in every way less desirable. And it may be that one reason why there is so much girding against measures of uniformity is that they supply just the kind of discipline which most of us so greatly need.

It is probably the case that nowhere have controversies with regard to uniformity raged more keenly than in the English Church at various periods since the sixteenth century. And yet it may be unhesitatingly asserted that, however imperfectly the order of the English Church may have been carried out at particular times, that order in itself is eminently reasonable and moderate; and its main elements, far from being in any sense novel, are to be recognised as existing long before the period of the Reformation.

The order of the English Church may be briefly summed up under three heads. (a) The Catholic faith is professed, and the Catholic creeds are strenuously asserted; but beyond this no attempt is made to bind the members of the Church to any exact uniformity of dogmatic expression.* (b) Uniformity of public worship, in its main lines, has been insisted on, but with a growing realisation of the need of elasticity to suit special places and special circumstances. (c) And in regard to each of these, the rule of the Church has the sanction and is under the joint control of the State; *i.e.* the conditions of Church membership and the interests of individual Churchmen are placed under the protection of the civil power.

This latter provision need not be considered at length, as it belongs rather to the subject of Establishment. Here it may suffice to say that the state of affairs in England differs only in degree, and not in kind, from that in Spain or Russia, where the Church is likewise "established"; and that if the same thing cannot be said, for example, of Italy or France, it is only owing to that baneful conflict between the ecclesiastical and civil powers which at present exists in those countries.

The other two heads must be considered at greater length. (a) As regards uniformity of dogmatic expression, it has often been pointed out† that there is at all times

* It need hardly be pointed out that the Articles of Religion are no part of the Book of Common Prayer, and only concern those who are called upon to teach. Cf. MAURICE, *The Prayer-Book and the Lord's Prayer*, p. 2 f.: "There are most conspicuous differences between the Liturgy and the Articles. . . . In short, these formularies differ generically; the one appertains to worship, the other to theological study; the one spiritual, the other intellectual; the one for teachers and people, the other specially for the teacher. . . . The Prayers, be they bad or good, are evidently meant for all, the Articles are meant for a class." The whole passage is of the greatest value.

† For example, by Bishop CREIGHTON, in his Primary Charge, *The Position of the Church of England*.

a danger lest the Church should presume to know beyond what has been revealed. The fact of God's working has often been revealed to us where the method of His work is of necessity beyond our ken ; so that it is often possible to affirm the fact without being able to know anything as to the method. And again, in theological speculation a point can soon be reached at which no answer is known to the questions which may be asked. In such cases the Church may either accept the limitations of its earthly habitation and walk humbly in faith : or it may endeavour to supply an answer, either from pious opinions, or from popular superstitions, or from the imagined revelations of visionary enthusiasts, to every question that can arise. There is a very real danger lest, by means such as this, the content of popular doctrine should gradually be changed altogether, until the resulting product could scarcely be described as Christianity at all. Such a tendency may be met in one of two ways : either by a rigid traditionalism which refuses either to review or to modify the theological formulas of the past, or by a careful Christian "scepticism," in the true sense of the word, which continually endeavours to "look unto the rock whence we are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence we are digged."

Strenuous resistance to over-dogmatism has long been one of the most noteworthy characteristics of the English Church, and we have usually met it by the second of the two methods above spoken of. Again and again innovations or popular distortions of doctrine have been rejected or protested against, on the ground that they were inconsistent with the very bases of the faith. Regarded in their widest significance, most of the great protests made by English Churchmen of the past were directed against this evil : against the erection into doctrines of the Church, to be accepted as of faith, of

things which were, at the best, mere pious opinions or plausible philosophical theories. Wyclif, Pecock, Colet, Tonstall, and John Frith alike worked with this end in view; and there can be no question that the bulk of the Marian martyrs laid down their lives in the same cause. No doubt many of them were men of little spiritual insight and even less knowledge; some were deplorably perverse and self-sufficient in their ways of asserting their opinions. They differed widely from one another in the deductions which they drew from the fundamental truths of the Gospels; and few persons at the present day would be so rash as to attempt to endorse the whole theological position of any one of them. But the cause which they upheld in common was greater by far than their individual opinions, and their cause is that of the English Church. Whilst steadily affirming the Catholic faith, it has ever resisted the tendency to encroach upon the liberty of the individual believer by making new terms of membership or communion. It has ever refused to make the way of salvation harder for simple men by narrowing down the majestic breadth of the Faith. This is the glory of the English Church; in this it stands pre-eminent in the West, or indeed in all Christendom.

(b) But it is at once obvious that such liberty of the individual would be a thing impossible unless it were accompanied by a very clear and definite assertion of the Faith in all the corporate acts of the Church. Without this there would be a betrayal, or at least a jeopardising, of the Catholic faith itself. Accordingly, individual liberty demands as its corollary the use of clearly expressed liturgical forms in public worship, which shall embody with completeness the mind of the Church. Moreover, if individual liberty of opinion is to prevail, it is imperative that the form should be observed without any substantial alteration or mutilation; for it is intended to supply a

safeguard for the faith of the Church ; and any alteration involves the intrusion of the views of certain individuals to the detriment of others, and to the despite of the rights of the Society as a whole. Once more, the actions of individuals, as it has already been observed, concern others in a way that mental dispositions can never do. A certain one-sided character may be given by their means to the corporate acts of the whole body, thus producing results more far-reaching than anything could which concerned the individual alone. Uniformity of public worship is therefore the natural complement and the indispensable safeguard of individual liberty ; and it is this, as the Archbishop of Canterbury recently pointed out, which gives much of its importance to ceremonial :

“Ceremonial is in itself a matter of not very great importance, but it touches our human nature on its weakest side. It probably causes more bitter controversy than anything else with which religion is concerned. It causes more and more groundless suspicion, more irritation, more irremovable discontent than deep differences of important doctrine and of hardly less important practice. It is for this reason that, as a rule, the Church of England has been more stringent in requiring uniformity of ceremonial than in any other regulation of her ministry. . . . The large tolerance of diversity in opinion in the Church, as contrasted with the strictness of the Church in regard to ceremonial, has certainly tended to make many believe that they have a right to claim the same freedom in the one as in the other. If they may teach, why may they not also illustrate that teaching by ceremonial which seems to them appropriate for the purpose? But to this the answer is plain. It is the unity of the ceremonial that makes the toleration of diversity of opinion possible. The ceremonial stands before us as the order of the Church ; the teaching is, and must be to a very large extent, the voice of the individual.” *

Nor is it merely a theoretical statement that uniformity of public worship is the natural complement of individual

* Archbishop TEMPLE, *Charge delivered at his First Visitation*, pp. 26-7.

liberty. Experience has shown that in England the two have stood and fallen together, and that those who have been antagonistic to the one have commonly been no less antagonistic to the other. In fact, it may be said at once that whereas the method of the Church is liberty of belief and uniformity of worship, the method of Puritanism, which is in this as in many other respects the very antithesis of all true Churchmanship, is precisely the opposite. The early Elizabethan Puritans, who refused the Oath of Uniformity and strenuously resisted the use of the Service Book, were likewise loud in their denunciation as unorthodox of all who did not agree with them; whereas Hooker, the advocate of sweet reasonableness and a large-hearted toleration, was likewise (and for this very reason) the stout champion of uniformity. The signatories of the Millenary Petition wished to be "eased and relieved" from the burden of common rites, but pleaded for "an uniformity of doctrine prescribed."* Their descendants of the reign of Charles I took up the same general position, and hated Archbishop Laud little less for his tolerance in religion than for his strictness in enforcing the observance of the Form upon those who had already promised to observe it. If they held him up to obloquy as a tyrant for his action in the High Commission, they likewise denounced him as a libertine on account of his friendship for such men as Hales and Chillingworth, and for his correspondence with foreign scholars of all kinds.

But the full development of this polity was not reached until the Puritans and their nondescript allies came to be in power in the Westminster Assembly. They first proceeded to abolish the Book of Common Prayer, and set in its place the Directory of Public Worship, which pointedly and deliberately precluded anything like uni-

* FULLER, *Church History*, vol. v. p. 306, ed. Brewer.

formity, leaving the control of public worship almost entirely in the hands of the ministers.* And then they compiled a series of documents, the Westminster Confession, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and the Directory of Church Government, which have become almost a by-word for the rigorous uniformity of doctrine which they attempted to impose upon individuals. Almost everything was made a matter of faith, and the most abstruse questions of religious philosophy and speculative theology were defined with an assurance and completeness which, however satisfying to those who drew up the documents, has been a very fruitful parent of unbelief in after days. The liberty of the individual minister was complete: he was little less than a petty pope. But the bondage of the individual layman was likewise complete: the Common Prayer was abolished, and in its stead he depended entirely upon what his parish minister chose to dole out to him. Accordingly, the first act of the English Church after the Restoration was to set these innovations on one side, and by a new Act of Uniformity to secure to the people their Book of Common Prayer, untrammelled by any restrictions at the hand of any minister whatsoever.†

The victory of the society might seem to have been complete. But in this, which was one of its most unfortunate

* Such directions as it contained were avowedly given, not with a view to the protection of the congregation, but as helps to the minister and safeguards of orthodoxy; "our meaning therein," as the Preface declares, "being only that the general heads, the sense and scope of the prayers, and other parts of public worship, being known to all, there may be a consent of all the Churches in those things that contain the substance of the service and worship of God; and the ministers may be hereby directed in their administrations to keep like soundness in doctrine and prayer, and may, if need be, have some help and furniture, and yet so as they become not hereby slothful and negligent in stirring up the gifts of Christ in them."—HALL, *Reliquiae Liturgicae*, vol. iii. p. 25.

† See HANCOCK, *The Act of Uniformity an Act of Liberation* (Church Historical Society's Publications, No. XLVIII.).

results, Puritanism is by no means dead yet. And there are a great many of our own day who might not inaccurately be styled neo-Puritans, and who, differing greatly in other ways, agree in their desire to be liberated from the observance of the law of uniformity in public worship. Not a few of them resemble the Puritans in another respect, and would not be unwilling to impose some new test for Church membership beyond those of the Church Catholic, provided that the test might be one which satisfied their own requirements. Such a position is surely disastrous. In the long run this procedure would lead to consequences which none would more greatly deplore than they who at the present time seem inclined to adopt it.

But uniformity of public worship cannot be supposed to exist only, or mainly, in order to make individual liberty possible without imperilling the common faith: it is also necessary in the interests of worship itself. If it be the case, as we have contended, that a certain degree of uniformity is a precedent condition of all public action, this is pre-eminently the case with public worship.

For it cannot be too clearly borne in mind that public worship is something essentially different from a mere aggregation of private worships. It is the corporate act of the Body, the expression of the fact that individually we are still incomplete, and are only capable of the full realisation of that for which we were made as members of a greater whole. It is, moreover, the highest act of our corporate unity: that which binds all that we do into one great offering to God. The late Professor Robertson Smith gave noble expression to this fact, in especial relation to the religious life of the Hebrew nation:

“True religion can never be the affair of the individual alone. A right religious relation to God must include a relation to our fellow-men in God; and solitary acts of devotion can never satisfy the wants of healthy spiritual life, which calls for a visible expression of the fact that we worship God together in the common faith which binds us into a religious community. The necessity for acts of public and united worship is instinctively felt wherever religion has a social influence, and in Israel it was more strongly felt because Jehovah was primarily the God and King of the nation, who had to do with the individual Israelite only in virtue of his place in the commonwealth.” *

And if this is true of Israel after the flesh, it is pre-eminently true of the spiritual Israel. In Dr. Hort’s words:

“Common worship must be felt to be, not the combination of individual worships, but the only worship which is not maimed and imperfect. Worship must interpret the belief that each man’s work must be wrong, even while he is unreservedly labouring for others, when he looks upon himself and his work as a whole, and not as part of a larger whole. When this belief is wanting, it seems to me that we may have religion coloured by Christian ideas, but not Christianity itself.” †

But two things are clearly necessary if there is to be any common worship worthy of the name. There must be a mutual understanding amongst the worshippers, and there must be an adequate channel for the expression of the common devotion. It is obvious, for example, as St. Paul teaches the Corinthians,‡ that neither prayer nor praise which is unintelligible to all but the individual who offers it, nor “speaking in a tongue,” can have any real place in public worship, since speech “in a tongue” cannot

* W. ROBERTSON SMITH, *Prophets of Israel*, first edition, pp. 96-7.

† *Life and Letters*, vol. ii. p. 109.

‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 5, 16.

edify the hearers, nor can they make the prayer or praise their own by their "Amen." To be representative it must be understood by the people; and anything which conduces to this end is, to this extent, a help towards the attainment of a higher common worship. Again, although extempore prayers may perhaps supply an adequate expression for the devotion of an individual, or the aspirations or needs of the society at some special moment of crisis, yet universal experience shows that it cannot adequately express the common worship of the society in all its largeness and all its depth. Even where the fact is not explicitly recognised, experience shows that prayer and praise tend naturally to crystallise into a liturgical form: the whole liturgical history of the Church is an illustration of the fact. This no doubt is in part the effect of a mechanical process; the mere act of repetition tends to round off our devotions into a form. But it is not by any means only a mechanical process. By degrees that which is accidental or partial or transitory drops off in order that what is permanent and vital may have truer and fuller expression. The merely subjective element is gradually banished because it does not apply in the majority of cases; and at length there is evolved a liturgy which applies to all sorts and conditions of men, not because it is so shallow, but because it is so deep; not because it overlooks all their individual needs, but because it goes beneath them all and includes them all. It is this majestic breadth and depth which has been observed, both by English Churchmen and others, in our Book of Common Prayer, and which called forth from Frederick Denison Maurice a noble protest in days when it was much spoken against:

"The evils which we bring with us to the Prayer-book are charged upon it. I believe that it is the great witness against them. Some of us would use it as an excuse for self-glorifica-

tion, for boasting of our superiority to foreign nations, or to the sects at home. Many of us would cast it aside that they may be more like foreign nations, or more like the sects at home. If we used it faithfully, I believe we should find it the most effectual deliverance from that spirit which converts our nationality into an instrument of dividing the nation, our privilege of belonging to a Catholic Church into a plea for exclusiveness. We should find, not that we should cease to be Englishmen in order to be men, but that we are Englishmen only so far as we claim our humanity." *

What has been said with regard to common worship may be summed up shortly: it becomes more perfect in proportion as it becomes more fully expressive and more fully representative. Each of these ends is served by the use of a liturgy; that is to say, by a measure of uniformity. For the very fact that a form for common worship has come into existence, and that it is made use of in the services of the Church, of itself involves uniformity. This after all is the starting-point of all uniformity of worship, and everything after this is merely a question of degree. The fundamental thing is the possession of a form of service which is well recognised and ascertainable, not dependent upon the arbitrary choice of the individual minister or congregation, but upon the will of the whole body. Where this exists, there is uniformity of worship; where it does not, there is not. Of course there are degrees of uniformity which may very naturally vary with times and peoples and circumstances. For example, the forms to be observed may vary in different dioceses; they may vary greatly in the minuteness or the largeness of their provisions, or in the strictness with which their provisions are enforced, or in the sanctions by which they are enforced. In England there has been even more of variation in these respects

* MAURICE, *The Prayer-Book and the Lord's Prayer*, p. xv.

than in most other lands: and although it is unnecessary to trace the variations in any detail, it may be worth while very briefly to recall their general course.

The main facts with regard to uniformity during the period down to the sixteenth century may be stated in general terms as follows: (*a*) In the words of the Preface to the Prayer Book of 1549, "Heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm, some following *Salisbury* use, some *Hereford* use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of *Lincoln*";* in addition, it may be added, to the various monastic Uses and some other local Uses, such as that of St. Paul's Cathedral, which did not survive so long. In other words, the sphere within which any particular Use prevailed was comparatively narrow, but in every case the Use itself was a clearly determined thing, regulated by authority, and in no sense vague and indefinite. (*b*) On the other hand, these Uses were far more minute in their provisions, especially in the service of the Holy Eucharist, than any of the later Uses of the Church of England, extending as they did to the gestures and even to the mental dispositions of the ministrant. We have only to turn to the Sarum Canon to see that this is so. The opening sentence alone gives us the following rubrics: "Here shall the Priest bow down his body, saying"; "Here he shall raise himself and kiss the Altar at the right of the Sacrifice, saying"; "Here he shall make three crosses over the Chalice and Bread, saying," and "having made the sign over the Chalice, he shall lift up his hands and continue."† The rubrics for the Hours were no doubt less precise, but the Hours themselves had grown to be extremely complicated; so that, although

* See the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer "Concerning the Service of the Church."

† W. MASKELL, *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, p. 112.

the difficulty doubtless arose in part from the irregularity with which the Offices were said, there is little if any exaggeration in the statement in the same Preface that "the number and hardness of the Rules called the *Pie*, and the manifold changings of the Service, was the cause, that to turn the Book only was so hard and intricate a matter that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out." (c) And once more, as regards the sanction which enforced these Uses, it was that of the Church only; for one of the chief consequences of the severance which had been made between the civil and ecclesiastical powers was that the rules of the Church were no longer enforced by direct civil sanctions as they would have been, for instance, in the days before the Norman Conquest. Nor was there at that time any particular tendency to vary from the services as they were appointed: the clergy inclined rather to omit the services altogether rather than to make new ones of their own. But still, the fact remains that the clergy were bound to use these services (*i.e.* the particular Use which pertained to the diocese or the order to which they belonged), and none other excepting such as were authorised by their ecclesiastical superiors. Any disobedience, or mutilation of the services, would have been punished by ecclesiastical penalties; and on the continent at any rate, probably in England also, there were many cases in which this actually occurred.

But already, at or even before the opening of the sixteenth century, there were signs of a tendency towards the establishment of uniformity upon a wider basis. It had no immediate connection with the Reformation movement, and was not specially English; in fact its influence was at least as widely felt on the continent as in England. Little by little, local Uses were being abandoned or modified in favour of others which were more widespread; some-

times by the willing adoption of external standards, more frequently as the result of external pressure. Thus, for example, in England the use of Sarum gradually supplanted all others; and it was intended that the process should be completed by the editions of the Sarum office-books which were printed in the reign of Henry VIII. Elsewhere things went further; it was not a case of abolishing all but one of several forms of the same national rite, but of abolishing a native rite in order to make room for one of foreign origin. In Spain, the ancient Mozarabic rite was practically suppressed by the direction of the Papacy; the Primate of Spain himself, the great Cardinal Cisneros, only being able to secure its continued use in a single chapel of his cathedral of Toledo. Other rites perished more gradually; but the result was that the reformed Roman Missal and Breviary at length came into general use throughout the Roman communion.

If now it be asked to what causes this process is to be attributed, the answer is twofold. In part, no doubt, it was the result of that insensate copying of all things Roman (or supposed to be such)* which has been productive of so many baneful results in Christendom, and of that confusion of uniformity with unity which has been spoken of at the beginning of this essay. But in part it was due to an entirely different cause. So long as the lay people did not travel to any great extent, and so long as circumstances precluded their knowing the contents of the service-books with any great exactitude or minuteness, the divergence of rites was not particularly noticeable. But as in course of time commerce brought men into closer relations with one another, and as the art of printing

* See a paper by Mr. Edmund Bishop on "The Genius of the Roman Rite," in which he shows how small a part of that rite can really be called "Roman" at all.

brought the divergences of the different rites more closely home to them, this was no longer the case. It would not have been unnatural that another form of service should prevail amongst men who spoke another tongue, and whose customs were different in all manner of ways; but that this should be so amongst their own people was less natural. In fact, the very purposes for which uniformity exists might seem to remain unfulfilled so long as there were so many divergences of this apparently arbitrary kind. And thus it was inevitable that there should arise a feeling after a larger uniformity.

In England this was especially the case. The making of an English service-book was above all intended to bring the services within the comprehension of all men; and the use of the vulgar tongue would have made local divergences, had they existed, still more noticeable. Simplicity and intelligibility were also to be amongst its notes; and each called loudly for the abolition of unnecessary variety. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the authorities of the English Church declared that "now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one Use." This "One Use" was at the same time enforced by the sanction of the civil power; and the statute by which this was done sets forth in majestic terms the principles upon which it was based. It rehearses that the Commissioners,

"having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages in the Primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient and sweet order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the Sacraments, to be had and seen in His Majesty's realm of England and in Wales; the which at this time, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one uniform agreement is of them concluded, set forth, and delivered to His Highness, to his great comfort and quietness of mind, in a book entitled, *The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the*

Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England."*

Moreover, in days when party spirit ran high, and men's passions had come to be enlisted on one side or the other, when the defenders of the new order had come to realise that they were fighting not only for their own existence, but for all that they believed to be of vital import to the Church; above all, when uniformity had come to be regarded as an end instead of a means, and was looked upon almost as a synonym for unity, it is little to be wondered at that they erred in the direction of overstraitness like their fathers before them. They did not indeed restore a minuteness of direction as to gesture such as there had been in the old English rite (and such as even then prevailed on the Continent), but they enacted that such directions as the book contained were to be carried out with exactitude, without addition or alteration. The Act of Parliament which ratified the reformed Prayer-book of Elizabeth directs that everything is to be done "in such order and form as" is "mentioned in the said book . . . and none other or otherwise"; and forbids the use of "any other rite, ceremony, order, form . . . than is mentioned and set forth in the said book."†

But even if such a stringent provision had been wise in itself, experience proved that it could not be carried out. There was a section of the English clergy, not inconsiderable in numbers and eminently respectable in character and attainments, who resolutely set themselves against the service-book and its provisions. They, or their leaders, had lived on the continent, and there had come into close relations with various bodies of foreign Protestants, from whom they had imbibed a distaste for the Book of Common Prayer, and indeed for any set form

* 2 & 3 Edw. VI. cap. 1.

† 1 Eliz. cap. 2.

of service at all. Some of them were willing to allow that the use of a liturgy was lawful, provided that free scope was given for divergences from it. To others, in the somewhat exaggerated stress which they laid upon the privileges of the individual, it seemed that such a thing was in itself an encroachment upon personal liberty. Others again held that a liturgy was an institution unscriptural, and therefore not only unlawful in the assemblies of Christians, but in itself wrong.

We need not follow out the struggle of Puritanism for mastery, or the short period of its apparent triumph; we are only concerned with the two opposing principles of individual liberty pushed to an extremity, and subjection of the individual will for the good of the Body. But these two principles are so well exemplified by the various documents of the Savoy Conference of 1661, that it is worth quoting a few passages in illustration. As soon as the Conference was opened, those who objected to the Book of Common Prayer were invited to give their reasons in writing; and they did this with so much of moderation and reasonableness that we should have to look far to find the "case against uniformity" better stated.* In the *Proposals of the Ministers* they say:

"We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy or form of public worship: provided that it be for the matter agreeable unto the Word of God, and fitly suited to the nature of the several ordinances and necessities of the Church; neither too tedious in the whole, nor composed of too short prayers, unmeet repetitions or responsals: not to be dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed Churches; nor too rigorously imposed; nor the minister so confined thereunto, but that he

* The various documents will be found collected in *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity of 1662*, with a preface by Dr. Peter Bayne. This volume was published in connection with the Bi-centenary Celebration inaugurated by the Congregational Union in 1862. Many of them are also given in Cardwell's *Conferences*.

may also make use of those gifts of prayer and exhortation which Christ hath given him for the service and edification of the Church."*

And they say also, in their *Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer* :

"That the gift of prayer, being one special qualification for the work of the ministry bestowed by Christ in order to the edification of His Church, and to be exercised for the profit and benefit thereof, according to its various and emergent necessity ; it is desired that there may be no such imposition of the liturgy, as that the exercise of that gift be thereby totally excluded in any part of public worship. And further, considering the great age of some ministers and infirmities of others, and the varieties of several services oftentimes concurring on the same day, whereby it may be inexpedient to require every minister at all times to read the whole ; it may be left to the discretion of the minister to omit part of it, as occasion shall require ; which liberty we find to be allowed† even in the First Common Prayer-book of Edward VI."‡

That there is a great deal to be said for this plea no reasonable man can deny, however much he may demur to some of the presuppositions of the ministers. But a very little consideration will show that they have not really exhausted the subject with which they deal. It is perfectly true that the gift of prayer is one of the chief gifts bestowed by our Lord for the work of the ministry ; but it does not follow that this gift is always to be exercised in one way, in season and out of season. It may be granted that the Church would be the better for

* *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

† This would appear to be a misunderstanding of the provision of the First Act of Uniformity with regard to occasional services : " Provided also, that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible, at any due time, not letting or omitting thereby the service or any part thereof mentioned in the said book " (2 & 3 Edw. VI. cap. 1).

‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 115.

the more frequent setting forth by authority of special prayers for its "various and emergent necessity" and that of society at large; but it does not follow that it would be the better were each individual minister to inaugurate special prayers whenever it appears to him that the world is out of joint or that the Church is in danger. Again, it may readily be granted that extempore prayer seems too often to be relegated to the background in our own day, and that it has a vital and most important place of its own, both in the life of the individual and in the collective life of the Body. It does not follow, however, that this place is in the public services of the Church; and the gift of prayer is at least as much exercised, or ought to be, in the use of the Liturgy as in extempore devotions. But above all, the weakness of the position of the ministers lies in the fact that they failed to realise what common worship, the worship of the whole Body, really means; they failed to realise, as Coleridge said of Baxter, that "public and private prayer are quite distinct—much in each incongruous with the other—and that *common* prayer neither can, nor ever was, intended to supersede individual prayer." * Moreover, one kind of interference with the services could not be permitted and another forbidden; if one may tamper with the services, then all may. Once more, when a minister desired to vary from the appointed service, it was certain to be due to the fact that he desired to omit something which he objected to or regarded as unedifying, or else that he desired to air some crotchet of his own. The claim for liberty, in fact, amounted to a claim to defraud Christ's people of the services of the Church, or some part of them, at the arbitrary will of an individual minister. And this the Bishops were resolved not to suffer under any circumstances.

Their answers were clear and to the point. As regarded

* S. T. COLERIDGE, *Notes on English Divines*, vol. ii. pp. 27-8.

the English Liturgy, they held that it was open to none of the objections which had been alleged ; and that it was for them to speak in the name of the Church :

“A liturgy, or form of public worship, being not only by them acknowledged lawful, but by us also (for the preservation of unity and uniformity) deemed necessary, we esteem the liturgy of the Church of England, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and by law established, to be such an one as is by them desired.” *

And as regards conformity to that liturgy, they hold that to allow exceptions would only be to foster strife :

“This experience of former and latter times hath taught us ; when the liturgy was duly observed we lived in peace ; since that was laid aside there have been as many modes and fashions of public worship as fancies. We have had continual dissensions, which variety of services must needs produce, whilst everyone naturally desires and endeavours not only to maintain, but to prefer his own way before all others ; whence we conceive that there is no such way to the preservation of peace as for all to return to the strict use and practice of the form.” †

Accordingly, the Prayer-book (as once more reformed) was restored, and all the clergy of the Church were compelled to use it faithfully, in the interests of the Christian people, and to protect them from the arbitrary tyranny of ministers.

“In regard that nothing conduces more to the settling of the peace of this realm (which is desired of all good men), nor to the honour of our religion, and the propagation thereof, than an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God ; and to the intent that every person within this realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship . . . be it enacted by the King’s most excellent majesty, by the advice and with the consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and of the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular ministers . . . shall

* *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 146-7.

be bound to say and use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, celebration and administration of both the Sacraments, and all other the public and common prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book."*

Those ministers who would not undertake to use the Book were of necessity removed from the benefices the duties of which they were no longer capable of fulfilling; and some of them thereupon seceded from the Church. We may regret that more of gentleness was not shown to them, and more of consideration for conscientious scruples; but the action of the Church upon the great question of principle involved cannot possibly be regretted. The Act of Uniformity was in the truest sense an act of liberation. It secured to Churchmen the enjoyment of their common heritage, free from the possibility that any should defraud them.

There are many amongst us who are still accustomed to speak of the Act of Uniformity of 1662 in terms of contempt and opprobrium. This surely is a grave mistake. Many of us may think that liturgical reform in one direction or another is gravely needed; that services which bear the marks of the conflicts of the sixteenth century are not at every point suited to the permanent usage of the Church; and that in our own day provision is needed for a greater enrichment of the services than was then contemplated. Very many more are convinced that the repeated endeavour (which has been made at any time during the last fifty years) to prove that the things which at the present moment meet our sense of fitness are just the things which were actually contemplated by the rubrics of the Prayer-book, is at once immoral in itself and highly impolitic in its results. But this does not really touch the question. Whatever the services appointed by authority may be, it is surely expedient

* 14 Car. II. cap. 4.

and right that they should be used and not neglected,* loyally used and not mutilated or overlaid with additions which are calculated to alter or disguise their true character. It is surely good that the rule of the society should be obeyed, not defied, by the individual.

It may be readily granted that uniformity, like every other good thing, has its dangers. The assumption which is frequently made, indeed, that conformity to an outward rule involves a loss of spontaneity is quite untrue; there is nothing which so invigorates the will as laying it down. In spite of much popular language, formularies have no monopoly of formalism. But none the less uniformity may be merely formal. That which was intended to be a deliverance from the arbitrary tyranny of the individual may only involve the submission to another tyranny even more lifeless, that of a system.

The English Church has endeavoured to guard against the danger, and has in some sense done so, by the largeness of her forms. We have already observed that the rubrical directions of the reformed English service-books

* It should be remembered that the neglect of the services during the last two centuries, grave as it has been, has at no time been acquiesced in by those who best represent the mind of the English Church. Bishop Butler speaks of it, in his *Charge to the Clergy of Durham* in 1751, in the following terms:

“In Roman-catholic countries people cannot pass a day without having religion recalled to their thoughts, by some or other memorial of it; by some ceremony or public religious form occurring in their way: besides their frequent holy days, the short prayers they are daily called to, and the occasional devotions enjoined by confessors. . . . Our reformers, considering that some of these observances were in themselves wrong and superstitious, and others of them made subservient to the purposes of superstition, abolished them, reduced the form of religion to great simplicity, and enjoined no more particular rules, nor left anything more of what was external in religion, than was in a manner necessary to preserve a sense of religion itself upon the minds of the people. But a great part of this is neglected by the generality amongst us; for instance, the service of the church, not only upon common days, but also upon saints’ days: and several other things might be mentioned.” (Bishop BUTLER, *Works*, ed. Gladstone, ii. 406.)

are never so painfully minute as those of the pre-Reformation service-books. Where the services are less complicated, and the rubrical directions less exact, there is less to induce the danger of a merely formal or outward uniformity. But this in itself can hardly be said to suffice: and indeed there is no formal principle whatever, and no external rule, by which we can effectually guard ourselves against the danger of formalism. Certainly the abolition of forms would not bring about such a result; for what we most need to be delivered from is the unreality of our own mannerisms and our merely formal actions.

All that the Church can do with a view to securing that the bulwark against tyranny shall not be turned into a tyranny, is to interpret her Acts of Uniformity in a large sense, with as much of laxity as possible under the particular conditions of time and circumstances. If we may judge from the practice of great Churchmen during the past three centuries, there has never been any reluctance to do this. Indeed, the words which were actually written in a different connection may be not inaptly applied to the largeness with which the Church has allowed her own rules to be interpreted: "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of *England*, ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting any variation from it." That such a large method of interpreting the rules of the Church is in itself desirable is obvious enough. Circumstances vary not a little, people vary from time to time and from place to place; and a wise rule must be elastic as well as reasonable. But whilst this is the case, no new right is given to any man to vary from the rule of the Church. It is for the authorities of the Church to settle how the law should be applied, not for the individual;

and nothing but the temper of willing obedience and large-hearted tolerance for the views of others can render possible that large application of the law of uniformity which most Churchmen at the present day would gladly welcome.

XVI.

Parties in the Church

BY LORD HUGH CECIL, M.P.

MANY influences combine to gather Churchmen into groups, or (as the phrase goes) schools of thought. Differences of opinion are inevitable. Even the most reasonable and charitable men cannot avoid disagreement. And when differences of opinion have arisen, the greater differences will tend to obliterate the smaller. Men are driven by the strong disagreement they feel with some opinions to look, first with indulgence, and then with approval on other opinions with which, wanting that propulsion, they would never have agreed. Other influences co-operate. Those whose opinions they partly share assure them that they cannot logically or reasonably accept part and reject part. It must be all or nothing. It matters not that they may have accepted certain beliefs, without logically proving them from premisses previously accepted. They may have arrived at them by any other path than logical ratiocination, which, as philosophers tell us, is the least used, though the most praised way to belief. Nevertheless, with the belief they are required to accept the premisses by which it might have been proved, and all the conclusions which may be drawn from those premisses. They are in the position of a young man who has married a lady without first making the acquaintance of her family, and who is obliged to accept the friendship of many from whom, unwedded, he would

have shrunk. The dogma to which he has given his heart compels him to receive parents and grandparents—nay, less fortunate than the bridegroom, an ancestry of many generations (for opinions are immortal), and all the numerous kindred who can trace descent to any of them. Even opponents, who themselves reject the whole clan, join in forcing him either to accept all or to reject all. All the world find the convenience of ready-made sets of opinions, and are unwilling to take the trouble of classifying an individual by himself. Since he holds some of the set, it is assumed he holds the rest; and under the pressure of the general judgment the assumption soon becomes true.

Schools of thought are therefore inevitable. But it is well to note that they are evils. They are obstacles to the candid and sincere search for truth. Opinions are adopted, not on their merits, but because they are the opinions of this or that school. There are, indeed, many other enemies to perfect candour of mind, and it would be perhaps an exaggeration to attach much importance to one misleading influence where there are many. If a man adopts High Church opinions for no better reason than that they are High Church, most of his convictions may have an origin even less respectable. To weigh on this one failing would be prudish. Yet unquestionably it is a failing, and should be guarded against. To hug, as many do, the names which have been attached to the different groups of Churchmen, is wilfully to hinder the knowledge of truth. It is besides to invoke a sentiment of partisanship. And partisanship is the parent of schism.

While the grouping of those Churchmen who are interested in theological discussion is natural and unavoidable, yet in calm times, or even in those which are not very rough, there are an immense number of good men who concern themselves little with the questions that divide

schools of ecclesiastical opinion. Even if they describe themselves as belonging to one or other, they sit loosely to it, and think little of what it accepts or rejects. Their influence is steady, and makes for charity and peace.

The Churchmen who are active in the discussion of theological or ecclesiastical questions are, it is well known, classified in three schools, quaintly described by the names of three dimensions. High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church are the three schools of the Church of England. But it must be noted that all three are not of the same nature. High and Low are alike: correlative and mutually exclusive. But it is not so of the Broad. Most of those who are called Broad might fairly be, and often are, also described as High or Low. A Broad Churchman is not, as such, concerned with the differences between High and Low. Sometimes he may blame or despise those differences; oftener he may take a side, ranking himself as High or Low. But his own distinctive name is not given or accepted on account of his views on the questions which divide the two. His characteristic opinions relate to other matters.

Here is encountered a difficulty. Briefly reviewing the parties in the Church it is necessary to write in general terms; but schools of thought are, after all, a rough classification. In spite of what has been noted of the tendencies which press people into groups, mutually agreeing on certain points, there remain in all three schools of thought considerable differences of opinion. Most of all is this so among the Broad. The name is applied with great vagueness. Those are called Broad Churchmen who entertain doubts as to the miraculous clauses of the Apostles' Creed; and so are those who trace many sources to the Hexateuch. Yet one opinion touches the very vitals of Christian theology and the other has almost no theological importance. Again, some

are called Broad because they resist the teaching and influence of Ritualists, believed to be narrowing; others because they defend Ritualists against an agitation which is thought to threaten the comprehensiveness of the Church. It would be difficult to limit the different kinds of opinion, the holders of which have been called Broad by themselves or by others. Yet there is, perhaps, in the minds of most people, a type of Churchman, ill-defined indeed, but not unrecognisable, which is called Broad, and to which those are supposed more or less to approximate who are given that name.

Typical Broad Churchmen are concerned to adjust the teaching of the Church to the new truths which the researches of men of science and learning bring to light. The present age has been rich in scientific and critical activity. Many of the results of that activity have been, or at least have seemed to be, inconsistent with established theological teaching. The characteristic function of a Broad Churchman is to consider the measure of these inconsistencies, and to re-state theological teaching in such a way as to remove them. This process is deemed to be best performed, when it is possible to reconcile theology with science or criticism by merely expressing the old theological propositions in new forms of words. But the Broad Churchman keeps prominently before his mind that it may be sometimes a duty, required by loyalty to truth, to sacrifice altogether a theological dogma. If the occasion arises he does not shrink. He feels assured that the abandonment of the fundamental dogma of the Incarnation can never be required. It is this conviction that stimulates him in his positive religious teaching, and encourages him in his most doubtful moments to maintain his place in the Church of England.

Broad Churchmen differ from High and Low in being the creation of the present century and having no far-

reaching history behind them. It is true that in the seventeenth century there arose a Latitudinarian school, which was long dominant, and which is not, perhaps, even now quite extinct. But it would be most unjust to Broad Churchmen to identify them with the Latitudinarians. The Latitudinarian was the enemy of what he called enthusiasm (meaning religious emotion verging on mania) and only to orthodoxy in so far as it ministered to enthusiasm. It may almost be said that his ideal was to be unspiritual. He thought of Christianity as an ethical system. Its spiritual side he kept as far as might be out of sight. A Christian, he believed, should study to be virtuous in conduct, wise in thought, prudent in language, decorous in demeanour. He should be careful in the performance of religious duties, because neglect of them was disorderly and unseemly. Religious emotion was an infirmity, pardonable, perhaps graceful, in a woman, but unfitting the dignity of man. The devotion of an Evangelical or of a Tractarian were equally alien from his mind. He was never converted; he was seldom a communicant. The Sacraments with their claim to bring the recipients into relation with the spiritual world, were foreign to his whole habit of thought. They seemed to him mere ceremonies, to be maintained as part of the ecclesiastical system, but of no great spiritual importance. The passionate throwing of the sin-laden soul at the foot of the cross, which was the chief note of Methodism and Evangelicalism, was still less congenial to him. He was free from great crimes or vices, and he was tranquilly happy in the approbation of his own conscience. Those who were not so innocent had better mend their ways, and not seek peace in extravagant language. Pitt on his death-bed exhibited this form of religion with striking completeness. He refused to receive the Communion, and expressed his confidence in the innocency of his life. It is difficult to

determine whether Pusey or Toplady would have been the more pained by such a state of mind.

But the religious standpoint of modern Broad Churchmen bears no resemblance to Latitudinarianism. The name of Maurice is by itself sufficient to remind us how little of the frigid antipathy to zeal which marked Latitudinarianism is to be found in a Broad Churchman of our own time. Broad Churchmen are not inclined to reduce Christianity to a mere system of morality, or to ignore the importance of warmth of feeling. Indeed, it may be feared that some are inclined to an error of quite an opposite character, and to substitute emotional sentiments for a reasoned or a definite belief. This tendency is clearly seen among those who, going beyond what can be properly called the Broad Church position, have lost faith in the Incarnation. They seek to substitute for Christian devotion an ardent sentiment of admiration for our Lord, considered as the greatest of men. Such an effort seems vain to Christians. But those who make it have plainly little in common with their parallels in the eighteenth century. Then the unbeliever thought he had all that he needed in a cold, unemotional deism. One would guess that such a man as Robert Elsmere would regard the scoffing of Gibbon with repulsion. Gibbon would almost certainly have thought Robert Elsmere silly. Vagueness, supplemented by sentiment, is the besetting error of many, both Broad Church and Agnostic. The Latitudinarian and the Deist were not conspicuously vague, and they abhorred sentiment.

Even where Broad Churchmen and Latitudinarians seem to agree there is a real difference. Both have a distaste for miracles, but the Latitudinarian who was still a Christian accepted the miracles of Scripture far more readily than the Broad Churchman now does. Doubtless this was partly under the pressure of public

opinion, but it may also have been because of the remoteness of miracles in point of time. Miracles, safely relegated to an age not later than that of the apostles, could not interfere with the ordered sequence of modern life. A story involving the supernatural in his own time, a Latitudinarian would have confidently set down to lunacy or superstition. The Broad Church attitude is different. Scripture miracles are rejected in varying degrees by Broad Churchmen. Few probably believe that Balaam was reprov'd by his ass. Some, perhaps, contrive to maintain their belief in the Incarnation, while reducing the Resurrection to a series of impressive visions. But no one would feel surprised to hear that a Broad Churchman was prominent in the investigation of spiritualism. He might even be heard of as an inquirer at Lourdes. To him the only objections to stories of miracle are critical and scientific. The Latitudinarian was, besides, disgusted by the very idea of the spiritual world intruding itself into ordinary life. A Broad Churchman might be a member of the Psychical Research Society. A Latitudinarian would have judged the members of that Society to be lunatics, fit for the asylum, or impostors, fit for the pillory.

Enough has been said to distinguish the Broad School from the Latitudinarian. And while the former is much the more attractive, it is also the more useful. The best Latitudinarianism could do was to instil moderation, and whatever the value of that function, it cannot compare in importance with the task Broad Churchmen set before themselves. Whether they perform it ill or well is, of course, a different question. But it is clear that to accommodate the claims of what is believed to have been discovered, with the claims of what is believed to have been revealed, is at all times highly useful, and in an age when general attention is directed to the achievements of science,

urgently necessary. The task of revising theological statements cannot be neglected if theology is to escape the fatal imputation of a legendary character. And Broad Churchmen deserve every credit for standing forth as mediators between two sets of truths, zealous to reconcile those that are really truths, and ready to repudiate as pretenders all statements which, though they are ranked among the revelations of God, are in reality the inventions of men.

To review what Broad Churchmen have done with this object, and to consider whether in each particular case they have done well or ill, would be to engage in a boundless inquiry, embracing innumerable theological discussions. But one or two general observations may be hazarded. It would sometimes seem as if the casting aside of established theology was undertaken less as a duty than as a pleasure. There seems to be an anxiety to be cleared of the suspicion of credulity, which is altogether a different thing from an anxiety to arrive at truth. The impression given is rather that subordinate doctrines are thrown overboard, not in deference to unanswerable reasoning, but in order to enhance the value of the support that is still given to fundamentals. And there is also, perhaps, a hastiness in assuming that the conclusions of learned men are final and certain, when, in fact, they are nothing of the kind. Yet over-ready and unnecessary concession to opponents is, in any controversy, one of the gravest mistakes that defenders can make. For there are very many people who do not concern themselves with the particulars of the argument, but who assume that whoever is retreating is defeated. That the point at issue is a minor one they do not understand. The Christian side is getting the worst of it, they think; therefore Christianity is false. Certainly a similar impression may be produced by defending with

futile obstinacy what is really indefensible; but this is a danger to which Broad Churchmen, at any rate, are sufficiently alive. They do not perhaps equally realise how harmful it is to incur without necessity the reputation of being obliged to abandon what Christians have long maintained. It suggests to many that Christianity is being devoured by modern enlightenment leaf by leaf like an artichoke.* If truth requires such a sacrifice, of course it must be made. But it should first be clear that truth does require it, and care should be taken to show the real proportion and relation of what is abandoned to what is still maintained. Obvious as these considerations are, it is to be feared they are not always borne in mind. And in some respects theological doctrines have been given up by many Broad Churchmen, not because there is any scientific objection to them, but merely, as it would seem, because they are inconsistent with the intellectual fashions of the day. Belief in the existence of devils and angels is a conspicuous instance. Probably a large number of Broad Churchmen would affirm that they had abandoned this belief; yet it is difficult to see any weighty objection to it. If there is a life beyond the grave, spiritual existence must be possible. There is no ground for thinking that human beings are the only spirits in the universe, and what we know of human beings shows that spirits are capable of an unlimited degree of goodness or its opposite. Apart from revelation therefore, there would seem to be no improbability in the belief that there exist angels and devils. But revelation teaches that belief with great distinctness. Why then reject it? I cannot help fearing that the motive is a desire to be modern, to make theology "up to date," to escape from the association of absurd mediæval legends, to keep clear of St. Dunstan and his tongs. Or else it may be

* As was said of Lombardy and Savoy.

the wish already noticed to sacrifice subordinate beliefs for the sake of enhancing the value of the adhesion still given to more vital ones. "I am no credulous old woman," one seems to hear it said. "I can disbelieve, I disbelieve in the devil; but I believe in God." It is possible such language might produce a good effect on some doubters, but plainly a desire to be able to use it ought not to determine belief. A wish to be modern or to be thought sceptical is not discreditable, but it is not loyalty to truth. And those who undertake to revise theology should be careful not to take that loyalty's name in vain.

On the whole, however, it would be unfair to deny that Broad Churchmen are doing good service to the Church. If attention is fixed not on this or that particular point, or this or that injudicious individual, but on the general work of the Broad Church School, it must be granted that such a school is at any time useful and at present well-nigh indispensable. But its work is, probably, not nearly so extensive as that of either the High or the Low. It aims at teaching the teachers. Its work is in the study or in the university or cathedral pulpits. Though there are doubtless many Broad Churchmen engaged in parish work, it is not likely that their characteristic opinions appear prominently in their sermons or in their visiting. A wise Broad Churchman would probably prefer that the ordinary Christian should be only indirectly affected by his work. It is with the clergy, and still more with professed theologians, that he is directly concerned. Through them he would gradually and almost imperceptibly reach the whole body.

High and Low Churchmen have a wider sphere for work. Their differences may be, and often are, of interest to persons of all sorts, from the most learned ecclesiastics to the most unlettered laity. There are indeed as already

observed, a large body who are not identified with either party ; but many, even of these, if they care for religion at all earnestly, are in any time of acute controversy not inclined to take a side.

What is perhaps the root-difference between High and Low it needs no profound learning to appreciate. All good Christians are agreed that it is of vital moment, that it is the very central idea of religion that the soul of man should be brought into relation with God. That man should believe in God, should fear Him and should love Him with all his heart, with all his mind, with all his soul, and with all his strength, is among Christians a common ideal. And all Christians are further agreed that this approach of man to God must be made through Christ, and can only be made by divine grace. They are even all agreed that there are to be found in rites and ordinances of one sort or another, means of grace by which man is brought through Christ to God. Even of Quakers this is true ; for plainly any religious custom—such as a meeting—which is thought to edify, must be thought to edify in the only way in which edification is possible, by facilitating the working of divine grace. But beyond this point there is far-reaching discord. The widest divergence of opinion exists as to the value and importance of rites and ordinances as means of grace. Here we need only concern ourselves with those degrees of divergence which are found within the Church of England. Even these seem notably great.

And yet there is a considerable measure of agreement. Rites and ordinances, decent and beautiful accessories of worship, all Churchmen admit to be, up to a certain point wholesome, and beyond that point dangerous. Nor in theory would that point seem difficult to fix. Every rite, ordinance, ceremony, and accessory of worship, all believe to be good if it leads the soul to God, all believe to be

pernicious if it attracts the soul to itself or to some creature, and so becomes a stumbling-block and not a help to religion. But this rule seems not easy to apply. When particular cases are considered Churchmen are found to differ violently. What seems to one helpful to true devotion, seems to another to be at least so far idolatrous that it diverts Christians from the whole-hearted service of God.

This difference is, perhaps, most acute in regard to the Eucharist. All think, indeed, that since it is Christ's ordinance it must be edifying. But Evangelicals fear that it may be, and that in the hands of the Roman Church it has been, so corrupted as to become one of the most powerful engines for turning away men's hearts from God that Satan has ever contrived. In the Mass they think the adoration that is due to Him is paid to a wafer, and the love and faith which ought alone to be produced by the mysterious sacrifice of the Cross are given to the acts of a priest. The splendid accessories of the service do but increase the evil. For what are the clouds of incense, the rich vestments, the altar with its lights and ornaments but so many chains to hold the soul down to earth, to keep it prisoned in the church, watching while a man works a marvel instead of fleeing far away to the green hill of Calvary, or soaring to heaven where the great High Priest is pleading for the people. "Do this in remembrance of Me," it was said; but it is not so done. It is not what was wrought upon the cross about which all are thinking, but what is now taking place at the altar. The celebrant has stepped into the place of the only Christian Priest; the consecrated wafer has been substituted for the only Saving Victim; and to creatures has been given the glory that belongs to the Creator.

Fearful of a corruption which appears to them so fatal to religion, Evangelicals are inclined so to frame the doctrine of the Eucharist as to exclude the possibility

of its idolatrous degeneration. With this view they reject all belief that the consecrated bread is really the Body of Christ, or that He is present otherwise than to the soul of the faithful communicant. Some, perhaps, go so far as to regard the Sacrament as only a commemorative feast, at which Christ is present in no other sense than He always is, where two or three of His disciples are gathered together. But most hold that there is in the Sacrament a special Presence which may rightly be called Real; but that It is only in the soul of the communicant. In like manner Low Churchmen generally reject the doctrine that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. But it would seem that by this rejection they do not seek to deny that in the Eucharist the atoning death of Christ is commemorated, and pleaded for the remission of sins. By “sacrifice” they understand some fresh propitiation for sin. To the recalling of the propitiation of the Cross they would not give the name of sacrifice. Indeed the pleading of the sacrifice of the Cross is at all times prominent among their devotions, and naturally would be so at a celebration of the Eucharist. The word “sacrifice” they reject as suggesting some repetition of or supplement to the Atonement. And while they thus dispute what they believe are errors in doctrine, they desire to keep the ritual limited to what may be necessary for decency and reverence. The simpler the service the less it is likely to minister to the errors and corruptions they dread. The more ceremonial, the more splendour, the more, it may be feared, are the minds of worshippers likely to think of what they see and hear to the exclusion of the spiritual truths on which they ought to be concentrated. Elaboration tends to intercept on behalf of material things that devotion which simplicity would conduct to the unseen. Nay, some go further, and in their anxiety lest the means of religion should absorb

what belongs to its end, would not give to the Eucharist what seems a too prominent position in Christian worship. Other parts of that worship, such as prayer or preaching, may, they think, be emphasised with less danger. Where there are only simple words there is little of the risk, inseparable from any rite, of turning a help into a hindrance.

And as with the Eucharist so with Baptism. Here, too, appears to Low Churchmen a danger of substituting a mechanical form for a spiritual relation between the soul and God. The doctrine that regeneration is effected by the mere administration of the Sacrament seems to them at variance with the spiritual character of religion. The effect on the mind of the baptised (if or so soon as they are of an intelligent age) is to put a physical act in the place of a spiritual one. The priest and the pouring of water are instead of God and the conversion of the soul. The doctrine of regeneration in Baptism is, however, so distinctly taught in the Prayer-book that it is only the most extreme Evangelicals who altogether reject it. Most accept it with such explanations as seem to remove its objectionable aspect.

About absolution Evangelicals feel still more strongly. Its connection with the practice of auricular confession powerfully influences them. But apart from any practical consideration they entertain a strictly theological objection to the idea of sacramental absolution. They reject all belief that absolution can ever amount to more than a recital of God's promises to contrite sinners. This may comfort the repentant by reminding them that God has met their contrition with forgiveness. That it can have any direct effect upon the well-being of the soul seems to Evangelicals one of the most dangerous of errors. For they think it is to attribute to a man the power of forgiving sins. If a priest is thought to be able to loosen

the bonds of sin Christianity is withered at the very root. It is as Saviour that Christ most of all claims the love and faith of His disciples. But if the heart-broken sinner is to take his grief to a priest, that priest becomes the central figure in the penitent's devotion. All the penitence, all the gratitude, which the sinner owes to God are laid at the feet of the priest. Evangelicals find it difficult to conceive a greater diversion to man of what belongs to God.

It may be here objected that to trace the whole characteristically Evangelical scheme of theology to a single root is not accurate. Certainly more than one cause has been at work, and is now at work, to produce Evangelical opinion. But while other sentiments have done much at one time or another to strengthen Evangelicalism, the most potent, as the best, seem to be a jealousy for the freedom of intercourse between the soul and God, and a fear lest that intercourse should be obstructed by what are supposed to be its means. Yet some other matters deserve notice.

Historically Evangelicalism is sprung partly from Puritanism, partly from Methodism. It inherits from both its parents a certain rigorous precision in small points of morality. From Puritanism it gets a traditional horror of Rome and of excessive ceremonial. These feelings are to-day nourished by the considerations already noticed, but it would be a mistake to deny that they have, from mere habit and tradition, other sources of support. "No Popery" is to some people an axiom, a self-evident proposition; and in current controversy it is common to hear objection taken to a doctrine or practice on the simple ground that it is Romish, as though that by itself were sufficient to condemn it. The epithet is felt to connect the thing condemned with that evil principle of which the fires of Smithfield, the Inquisition, the Massacre of

St. Bartholomew, the Gunpowder Treason, Queen Mary Tudor, King James II., the lawlessness of Ireland, the decay of Spain, and the persecution of Captain Dreyfus are so many results.* Long dwelling on the idea of Roman corruption has produced a degree of abhorrence for Rome which has well-nigh passed the point where that sentiment renders its subject incapable of rational discussion. Those who are most imbued with this feeling will not pause to listen to any distinction between the bad and the good in Rome. Even the defence that a particular opinion is held also by Russians of the Eastern Church or by German Lutherans avails little. Whatever is popish is wrong, and to palter with it is to be a traitor or a dupe.

This foolish and violent prejudice is, it may be hoped, now fast losing power, though it still exists. Another element once conspicuous in Evangelicalism, and intellectually far more elevated than "No Popery," seems to be extinct. There is, perhaps, nothing more remarkable in the history of the English Church than the disappearance of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination and reprobation during the last hundred years. The gloomy dogma that "God from eternity hath predestinated some to life; some He hath reprobated to death," which once, under Archbishop Whitgift, almost became part of the formularies of the Church, and which even in the earlier part of the present century was probably held by many, is now so entirely rejected that it may be doubted if a single clergyman would affirm it. Bearing this in mind it is interesting to read the Thirty-Nine Articles. From IX. to XIX. one is reminded of old disputes at every turn. These Articles bear all the traces of controversy. They are as cleverly comprehensive as

* It is not intended to be denied that this way of thinking has real force against Romanism as a whole. But against any particular doctrine or practice it is ineffective.

any of the later ones. But now they excite little interest. They have helped to keep the Church of England together for three hundred years. Now their part is done. Their pacific task is performed. They are retired diplomatists. How long will it be before the remainder can, in like manner, rest from their labours, before controversy will no longer concern them, before none but theologians will read them, unless it be to beguile the tedium of a dull sermon by a tranquil admiration for their dexterous ambiguity? This seems a far-off vision; but at least it is possible to rejoice that in reckoning the parties in the Church no count need now be had of Calvinist or Arminian.

It has already been apparent that closely connected with the jealousy of what may come between God and man is a dislike and dread of the power, prerogatives, and influence of priests. Yet this feeling is not altogether caused by that jealousy. Other considerations co-operate to produce it. The tradition of the tyrannical priesthood of mediæval times, the spectacle of what Roman priests can and will do in Ireland or France, suggest the apprehension that even in the English Church and at the present time clergy might abuse the position given them by religion for the worldly advantage of the Church or even for their personal aggrandisement. This apprehension affects Englishmen on their most sensitive side, for it alarms their love of liberty. That anyone should under any circumstances dictate to them would be intolerable. But that advantage should be taken of religion in order in its holy name to dictate, would be a revolting addition to the grievance. Nor would it be lighter for being inflicted by a class who, even as things are, excite an irritation which is not doubtful, because its cause is obscure. Many who on other points feel little interest, strongly side with Evangelicals in resisting anything that

seems likely to lead to priestly ascendancy. The strength of this feeling is seen chiefly in the opposition displayed to private confession. The religious objection to absolution as a sacramental ordinance, which has already been considered, is immensely reinforced by this stronger fear of priestly power. Many who would care little for the theological question are warmly excited against the authority and influence which it is thought the confessional gives to priests. They find small comfort in the reflection that the very greatness of the evil they fear makes it impossible. It is vain to urge that Englishmen are far too deeply attached to their liberty to allow it to be taken away, and that, if confession does indeed mean priestly dictation, confession will never be common among Englishmen. If men would not submit, it is answered, women might. No man would be master in his own house; his wife and daughters would owe obedience to another. And this aspect of the matter becomes almost maddening. Even persons ordinarily of quiet and well-balanced minds are so stirred as to make it impossible for them to look at the question from any point of view but one. The hideous idea that an unprincipled or morbid-minded priest might pollute the purity of young penitents adds to the horror, and helps to make the dread of auricular confession the most vehement element in the controversies that disturb the Church.

The brightest side of Evangelicalism has yet to be noted. That they reject anything that seems to interpose between God and man has been dwelt upon. But it would be most unfair to treat their attitude as merely negative, to write as though their zeal for religion only availed to make them blame the opinions of others. The glory of Evangelicals lies in their vivid sense of the reality of the relation between man and God, in their

strong faith in the divine mercy, in their passionate devotion to the Person of our Lord, in the abundant love of others which they display—in short, in the vital character of their Christianity. Certainly it is not all Evangelicals of whom this can be said. Some who are called by that name are very unamiable persons. But a good Evangelical deserves the sincere reverence of Christian people. He ranks high among the saints.

But High Churchmen, on their side, claim that their opinions include all that is best in Evangelicalism. They refuse to admit that Evangelicals have any monopoly of vital Christianity. The devotion and piety of the best men of both schools is much alike. High Churchmen, they affirm, only add something to Evangelicalism. They accept what is good, and complete it. High Churchmen are Evangelicals and something more.

It is perhaps truer to say that Christians of all schools are much alike at their best. Especially a point of union is always found in personal loyalty and devotion to Christ. This sentiment may, indeed, be regarded as the essential characteristic of Christianity. Where this is found there are always found the peculiar influence and consequences which mark that religion, and, above all, a certain refinement and spirituality of mind which is difficult to describe, but which is seen in Christians of all sects and denominations, but not, it may be suggested, among non-believers even of eminent virtue. The word "effulgence" perhaps best describes this peculiar quality; and those who possess it recall to the mind how Moses veiled his face from the Israelites when he came down from Sinai. But it is unnecessary to labour the description of what has been drawn by a master-hand in the character of Dinah Morris in *Adam Bede*. A Dinah Morris not wrapped up in a personal devotion to Christ is inconceivable; and both the devotion and the mental beauty

that goes with it are to be found in the best Christians of all schools. That they are found among both High Churchmen and Evangelicals is, therefore, not remarkable.

Yet there is historically ground for saying that the High Church movement of the present century arose out of the Evangelical movement which preceded it; and the two have a natural connection. All propagation of Christianity must begin with converting individuals. And this was and is the characteristic aim of Evangelicals. They strive to awake men to a sense of their sins and to bring them one by one to Christ. The next stage of the progress of the gospel is to organise those who have become disciples into the Church. And it is to arouse the disciples to a sense of what the Church is, what are its claims upon them, and their duties to it, which is the characteristic aim of High Churchmen. Both movements of course differed from regular missionary work, in that they sought to revive and restore what had been already done, and not to begin afresh. But, allowing for that distinction, they followed the order of every mission. First the Evangelicals re-proclaimed the Gospel, then the Tractarians revived the Church. And as belief in the Church, its teaching and title to obedience, imply a prior acceptance of what concerns the salvation of the individual, such as a sense of the reality of sin and of the efficacy of the Atonement, it may be argued that so far as the positive teaching of Evangelicalism goes, Tractarianism includes and adds to it.

But it would seem on examination that, even apart from what Evangelicals reject, which High Churchmen accept, there is a difference. The fact that High Churchmen hold something more, makes a difference even about what both seem to hold in common. Evangelicals dwell more on the salvation of the soul and what concerns it, in proportion to their whole theological system, than do

High Churchmen. The best, indeed, as already observed, in both schools tend to be alike. But the less than best Evangelicals are, perhaps, accustomed to think of their own souls as the centre of the spiritual world; as though, if they go to heaven, the main object of Christianity will have been achieved. From this mode of thinking High Churchmen are to some extent preserved by an interest in the Church and its welfare. Evidently there are dangers on both sides. If the Evangelical becomes self-centred, the High Churchman may well get to neglect the supreme importance of personal holiness. Here these different perils need not be discussed. It is sufficient to note the two points of view.

It is, however, in regard to what Evangelicals reject and oppose, that the main distinction between them and High Churchmen is found. High Churchmen acknowledge that there is a danger that what are meant to be means of devotion may really intercept and detain the faith, love, and worship they ought to help forward. They admit that the devotions of the Roman Church are to some extent open to this criticism. But there is, they think, an opposite danger. If all means are cast aside, access to God is not more easy, but less so. If ordinances and rites are abandoned, they do not give place to a more spiritual and direct communion with God, but to allowing the idea of Him to become distant, visionary, ineffectual. Nay, the institution of Sacraments by Christ proves that this is so. There must be no effort to evade the full force of the lesson He then taught the Church. Rites and ordinances are the appointed connection between God and man. By them God's grace descends to man. By them man can draw near to God. Not only must the two great Sacraments be put at the very head of Christian worship. Loyalty to Christ requires no less than that. But the Church is justified in proceeding on the same

path, and using material means to aid in spiritual devotion. Whether this particular rite or ceremony is good or bad must be determined on the merits of each case. But that rites and ceremonies are legitimate and may be highly edifying is proved by the sanction given to ceremonial in the Sacraments. Not, certainly, that the Sacraments are no more than ceremonies; but ceremonies they are, and so consecrate the use of ceremonial.

Nor would High Churchmen admit that Evangelicals were justified in the full extent of their attacks on Rome. Both schools do, indeed, agree in rejecting much that is Roman and especially the papal authority. But in regard to the controversies about the priesthood and the Sacraments, High Churchmen are far from assenting to the Evangelical censures on Romans. High Churchmen do not, indeed, approve the Roman system; but their objections to it, though serious, are not of the fundamental character which belongs to those which Evangelicals entertain. The Roman mode of celebrating the Eucharist seems to High Churchmen far from perfect; but they cannot call it idolatrous. They disapprove the refusal of the cup to the laity; they disapprove the unsound metaphysics of the doctrine of transubstantiation. All, save perhaps a few extreme men, disapprove of the widespread custom of solitary celebrations, and of the tendency, which goes with that custom, of separating the use of the Eucharist as a sacrifice from the Communion. With the same possible exceptions, they disapprove of calling the Eucharist propitiatory, though they may doubt whether the Romans use that epithet in the same sense as Anglicans reject it. But they would refuse to deny, and many would affirm, that Christ is really present in the consecrated elements, and not only to the soul of the communicant. They would affirm that the Eucharist was a sacrifice, and would decline to admit

that such an opinion was at variance with Article XXXI. In general they would incline to believe that the gravest Roman errors in regard to the Eucharist are to be found rather in the impression actually given to the people than in the formal statements of theologians. Perhaps the most serious objection they would make to Roman theology on this topic is that it lends itself to be depraved by faulty teachers or foolish learners, till what is believed is a physical transformation and a repeated Atonement. It is not enough, they would say, that these things are not authoritatively laid down. It is the duty of the Roman Church to guard her disciples effectually from such errors ; but this she has not done.

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration High Churchmen accept as distinctly as do Romans. Absolution High Churchmen regard as conveying a real spiritual benefit, and therefore as sacramental. But about the use of it, and the value and dangers of private confession, High Churchmen are sharply divided. The great majority agree with Evangelicals in thinking that it ought to be a rarely used remedy for a special difficulty. The minority think that it must be counted part of the ordinary defence against sin, and should be used three times a year, or at other like convenient periods. All agree in thinking that its use or disuse must be entirely free and voluntary, and reject the Roman rule making its periodical use compulsory, and the Evangelical claim that that use is or ought to be illegal. And though many High Churchmen believe frequent confession to be unwise and pernicious, they would probably think there was much exaggeration in the attacks on it.

In regard to the general position of the priesthood, High Churchmen are not ready to feel fear of sacerdotal tyranny. They do not believe that in the present age, when liberty of thought, speech, and action is so zealously

extended and so carefully guarded, there is danger of a restoration of the mediæval authority of priests. Doubtless to overthrow that authority was a great effort for the Reformers in the sixteenth century. But to restore it in the twentieth, when the whole movement of the human mind has been in an opposite direction, when even in countries which are still in the Roman Communion, it has been modified past recognition, seems to High Churchmen beyond possibility. Certainly it constitutes no such danger as to excuse depriving the Sacraments of their rightful prominence, or departing from the general belief of the Church throughout the early centuries. Abuses are no doubt possible. Let them be guarded against; but not by neglecting or obscuring the rites that Christ instituted, or by shrinking from doctrine conformed alike to the language of Scripture and the teaching of the Church.

A very large part of the controversy between Evangelicals and High Churchmen turns on what are really questions of fact. Whether by emphasising Sacraments people are led to God or turned away from Him; whether there is serious danger of idolatry in the Eucharist; whether belief in the efficacy of absolution leads to the oppression of the laity by priests; whether ceremonial helps or hinders true devotion:—these are questions of fact. Perhaps some day experience may convincingly answer them, and disagreement will be at an end. But in the meantime the answer depends on each man's estimate of human nature. It is therefore not surprising that there should have arisen a wide difference of opinion.

The least clear part of the High Church position is not connected with the advantage or danger of means in religion. High Churchmen are on much less easy ground when they dilate on and appeal to the "authority of the Church." The great difficulty of combining the authority of the Church with the authority of Scripture drives High

Churchmen, and, indeed, those Evangelicals who at all accept Church authority, into many different positions. Some treat the Church as so freely appellable to Scripture that their deference to her guidance amounts to no more than accepting from her those interpretations of Scripture which they agree with; some accept her teaching when the teaching of Scripture is doubtful, but not when the two seem plainly contrary; and as to what is plain and what doubtful one man differs from another. Some accept the teaching of the Church in every case; but that by no means settles the matter, for there is a wide divergence of opinion as to what is to be understood as the authoritative teaching of the Church. Some accept only what they regard as the oral tradition of the apostles; some the teaching of the ante-Nicene Fathers, because then the Church was persecuted and therefore pure; some the teaching of Fathers and Councils before the schism between East and West; some the teaching generally accepted in all ages by the whole Church; some the teaching generally accepted at the present time; some the teaching accepted at the present time by the whole Church except (quaintly enough) the Anglican Communion. Thus there are an untold number of different opinions as to the seat and finality of Church authority. High Churchmen are more unanimous in an undefined sentiment of zeal and enthusiasm for the Church. They glory in their membership. They bitterly lament the schisms that divide the Church, and long for reunion. Doubtless, failing reunion, many desire a measure of outward resemblance between the different branches of the Church. And this is one source of the movement for more elaborate ritual. Many desire to make the English services, and especially the Eucharist, visibly the same in the English as in the Eastern and Roman Churches. That the great Christian rite must always be essentially the same does not satisfy

them. They would have its identity manifest to the most casual observer; so that all the world should know that one and the same awful commemoration is made in London, in Moscow, and in Rome.

Zeal for the Church naturally makes High Churchmen impatient of any interference by the State in spiritual matters. They object to anything which allows the State to determine what the Church should teach, and accordingly resent the supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Privy Council. This repugnance to Erastianism is now one of the strongest sentiments among them; and it is the chief bond of sympathy between Ritualists and more moderate High Churchmen. Many High Churchmen are driven to take the side of Ritualists, not because they do not see faults in Ritualism, but because they dislike the Erastian methods of its opponents.

So far attention has been devoted to what are ordinarily called parties in the Church of England. But this use of the word is not precise. A party is a combination of persons to achieve common aims. No party can be with strict propriety spoken of, unless there is combined action. A mere identity or similarity of opinion among a number of persons is not sufficient to constitute a party. There must be common action, and for common action there must be, however informally and temporarily, some organisation.

It follows that what are often called parties in the Church are not rightly so called. The High Church party, the Low Church party, and the Broad Church party are strictly not parties. They have no leader, no common organisation, no system of combined action. They are only schools of thought: categories in which Churchmen may conveniently, if roughly, be classified according to their opinions. The names are useful to

describe shortly those who give special prominence to certain beliefs. But those described are in reality no more parties than they are armies.

Similarity of opinion is indeed an essential element in making a party; and where it exists a party is readily made. If an emergency arises, Churchmen who think alike form themselves easily and rapidly into some kind of organisation, which may be lasting, but is oftener temporary. The past year has seen the gathering of more than one such party. Broad Churchmen have formulated the Whitehall resolutions. Others have taken counsel and action together to resist the Liverpool Church Discipline Bill. Protestant ladies have joined together under Lady Wimborne to support "the principles of the Reformation." But these parties are avowedly organised to meet special emergencies; and only the last named has been organised for more than a few weeks or months. It may be permanent, but if so it is likely soon to become ancillary to a more important body, the Church Association.

That Association is the principal organisation of one of the two true parties in the Church of England. The adherents of the Church Association and allied societies on the one hand, and of the English Church Union on the other, are parties in the strict sense of the word. They are combinations with definite objects, which they actively pursue. They have all the apparatus of parties. They have leaders who guide them; secretaries who organise them; lecturers who propagate their opinions; vans and colporteurs, pamphlets and leaflets to recruit their forces and give them strength for victory.

In this warfare the Church Association is now, at any rate, the aggressor. The objects for which this Association was founded in 1865 were declared to be "to Uphold the Doctrines, Principles, and Order of the

United Church of England and Ireland, and to counteract the efforts now being made to pervert her teaching on essential points of the Christian faith, or assimilate her Services to those of the Church of Rome, and, further, to encourage concerted action for the advancement and progress of Spiritual Religion."* These objects it pursues with the help of an elaborate organisation and by various methods. Part of its work is educational, that is to say, it consists in the delivery of lectures and the circulation of a great number of leaflets and tracts. To help in this work the Association has gathered a library for the use of its members. But it also aims at securing its objects through the agency of Parliament and Courts of Law. It boasts of having procured the condemnation by Ecclesiastical Courts of no fewer than sixty ceremonies and practices. And its present scheme of policy is entirely to concentrate its strength on the effort to induce Parliament to assent to such alterations of the law as will, in the opinion of the Association, facilitate the deprivation of those clergy who are believed to be subverting the Protestant character of the Church. The nature of the Association's proposals is well known. The offenders are to be brought before a court in which a secular judge presides, to be inhibited and, if contumacious, to be deprived, with no other remedy than an appeal to the Privy Council. The bishop is to have no veto, but is to sit as an assessor, impotent, and possibly speechless, while, one by one, clergy for whose piety and devotion he entertains the warmest admiration are removed from the cure of souls in his diocese. These proposals are being pressed upon Parliament by all the methods known to political agitation. The Church

* See *The Church Association and National Protestant League. What it has done or is doing, and why it ought to be supported*, p. 5. Published at the Association Offices.

Association avows that it aims at putting pressure on members of Parliament. Petitions, letters, Protestant Hundreds, Lodges of the National Protestant League are among the goads by which it hopes to bring a reluctant House of Commons to assent to its bill. Even the nominally educational part of its work is, to a large extent, directed to the same end. Vans are dragged through the country, lecturers expound, leaflets are distributed not only to make people "Protestants," but also to make them make their representatives "Protestants" too.

It is difficult to insist too strongly on the folly and harmfulness of this agitation. Against the properly educational work indeed not much need be said. It is not merely harmless, but a duty to try and persuade people for truth and against error. Since the Church Association and its friends believe that Protestantism is in danger, they are quite right to use all the arts of controversy and exhortation to preserve it. But the language employed is not always so moderate and so considerate of the feelings of others as might be wished. There is not much fraternal kindness about the rebukes addressed to the Ritualists. The heart of hardly anyone is likely to be softened by his being called a perjured traitor. And worse than violence of language is the tendency to treat High Churchmen and Ritualists not as members, however faulty, of the Church, but as enemies. What is in everything but form a schism is thus created; and the evils of a schism are felt. The Church is divided against itself; and it is not only the kingdom of Satan that is so brought down.

But it is to the policy of coercion, whether by prosecuting under the existing law, or under a new and more effective law, that the gravest objection must be taken. For prosecution is not a proper remedy against a body of

opinion. It may, of course, be used to restrain the irregularities of a few persons. But the Church Association do not seek to conceal that their object is not to put down casual irregularities. They aim rather at expelling a school of thought from the Church. They think (as they are entitled to think) that the movement of opinion begun by the *Tracts for the Times* is a bad movement; and they desire to see opinion, not, certainly, in regard to pastoral activity or the like, but in regard to doctrine and ritual, brought back to the *status quo* of 1833. There is nothing illegitimate in such a desire. The error lies in the means by which they seek to achieve their purpose. They aim at effecting this change of opinion by action in the Law Courts and in Parliament. And it is certain that such changes of opinion neither ought to be nor can be so effected.

It is surprising that the impossibility of their undertaking is not more obvious to the Church Association and its friends. To put an end to the use of Eucharistic vestments is a small part of what they propose to themselves. There are said to be more than 2,000 clergy who use those vestments at present. Evidently, therefore, if the tribunals sat for 300 days a year and disposed of one case each day—and they would do neither of these things—it would take six years and eight months to remove the peccant clergy. In a very large number of cases the patrons would present and the bishops would institute men of like mind, and the game would begin again. It would seem, therefore, difficult to set a limit to the period of time which, by the method of prosecution, would be required in order to put an end to the wearing of vestments. Yet the spectacle of the Judicial Committee, condemned perpetually to hear arguments on the legality of vestments, is surely fitter for purgatory than for this present world. It need not be added that the difficulty of

want of time would not actually arise. Before twenty incumbents had been deprived, there would be a violent reaction of public opinion against prosecutions; and either they would be discontinued or Parliament would intervene to put a stop to them.

It is probable that no one would be silly enough to think ritualistic practices could be put down by such a method, if it were not for the example of the sixteenth century. Observing how large a part the State took in carrying through the Reformation, the Church Association is led to think that what the State did once it can do again. So put the opinion sounds reasonable; but it is a complete mistake. The State did not, indeed, even in those days attempt to deprive 2,000 clergy by separate prosecutions. Only a much smaller number, 189, were deprived after Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity.* But there is no possibility of repeating the methods of the sixteenth century. Then the great majority of the clergy changed with astonishing ease from Papist to Anglican and back again. The motive was, I am afraid, fright. To resist the State involved heavy penalties, and only a few were prepared to face penalties. But now the State can inflict no penalty worse than deprivation—even simple imprisonment without peculiar hardships has been found impossible. Nay, it is more than probable that even deprivation, if applied in more than a very few instances, would be found too harsh for public opinion. And if the State has become more tender-hearted, the clergy have become more high-principled. So that the idea of a reformation effected by the power of the State is quite antiquated. Whatever may be a remedy for Ritualism, coercion by the State is none.

There is a use of courts which is not coercive. If there

* Whether by prosecution or some more summary method, I do not know.

is confidence in a court, its decisions are accepted not out of fear, but out of respect. The archbishops have with a large measure of success constituted themselves, under the preface to the Prayer-book, a tribunal of reference on questions of ritual, and have done more to restrain the liturgical use of incense than the Church Association would ever have effected. On these lines much might have been done to resist Ritualism if the anti-Ritualist party had been wiser. By insisting on State courts for ecclesiastical causes they played the game of their opponents. If the moment the question of the character of the courts was raised, they had taken Ritualists at their word, and set up courts which could not be accused of Erastianism, the progress of Ritualism would have been greatly retarded. Any courts would probably have decided many points against the Ritualists, and courts free from the stain of Erastianism would have spoken with an authority which cannot belong to the Privy Council.

The evils that spring from the action of the Church Association are grave. The demand for ecclesiastical coercion exacerbates the divisions of the Church to a dangerous degree, and besides the ultimate peril of disruption, those divisions already paralyse the action of the Church as a whole, prevent it obtaining the relief that is needed for denominational education, and obstruct the progress of general Church Reform. It forces, moreover, High Churchmen who are not Ritualists, but who do not like wholesale deprivation or Erastianism, to extend a measure of countenance and assistance to Ritualists, which they would certainly not give if the dispute were mainly kept in the region of argument and persuasion, and if such occasional exercise of coercive discipline as a special case might require was by universal consent left in the hands of the bishops.

Next to the Church Association in culpability for eccle-

siastical divisions is the English Church Union. Its objects are, indeed, nominally innocent. Briefly, they are to maintain the doctrine and discipline of the Church, to resist unjust aggression in spiritual matters, and generally to promote the interests of religion. Nothing could seem more harmless. In one of its publications the Union even claims that its motto is "Defence, not defiance." But in truth it is a centre of disunion and partisanship. So powerfully have the English Church Union and the Church Association stimulated faction within the Church, that now the dispute is conducted much in the manner and language which political parties are accustomed to employ. The honoured names of Catholic and Protestant are degraded to be party badges. Appeals are made to "Catholics" to be loyal to one another, and stand by one another. "Stand by your priests," wrote Lord Halifax, appealing apparently to no principle of ecclesiastical order, but to motives of personal loyalty. Lord Halifax himself exercises an authority over the Union similar to, but greater than, the authority of a political leader. His influence, so far as the members of the Union are concerned, throws that of the bishops into the shade. His lightest word is, indeed, heavy. Ability, eloquence, and high character fit him for his post. He guides the tactics of his party: for the English Church Union thinks much of tactics. They want to make their party win; and how to win they appear to consider in a temper not very unlike that of Mr. Schnadhorst or Mr. Middleton. They seem to feel no incongruity in the idea of a Catholic caucus. That Church controversies ought to be conducted in an altogether higher spirit does not seem to cross their minds.

And yet surely it is so. In politics something of that suspension of the laws of perfection which is obvious in war is allowable. It does not, of course, go near so far.

Politicians may not kill, but they may rightly say bitter and cutting things. Many deceptions permissible in war would be infamous in politics. But politicians cannot be, and ought not to be, perfectly candid. The idea of Cabinet secrecy and unity, and the idea of party loyalty imply a certain disingenuousness. Many other illustrations of an imperfect morality might doubtless be pointed out. Politicians, like soldiers, must to some extent employ means which are not perfectly conformed to the Christian ideal. But it ought not to be so within the Church. There the perfect law to which the world is gradually being raised is already in force. Church controversies must be strictly conducted in accordance with the precepts of the gospel. Meekness and humility, not a skilful aggressiveness, must be their characteristic note. But no one can say that those virtues are the most prominent qualities of either the Ritualist or the anti-Ritualist parties. Strong speeches to excited meetings, and defiant manifestoes published far and wide, every word ringing with the joy of battle, are thought fitting methods of discussing what ought to be the painful differences of brethren. But to speak of a fraternal tie between the Church Association and the English Church Union is to be ludicrous. The ideas of brotherhood and of these societies have that element of contrast which is said to be the essence of humour.

It may be said, and is most true, that there is much kindness and real charity in the hearts of the better men engaged in these controversies. The black vices of hatred and malice do not mingle in their combativeness, and were they politicians one need ask no more; but combativeness itself is out of place in the Church. If controversy is necessary, it should be conducted with a studious considerateness and moderation. Every concession that faithfulness will allow should be made, and when the

limit is reached there ought to be felt a real and acute pain. Does anyone claim that this has been the spirit on either side? And what is true of controversy among brethren is true also of disobedience to superiors. Both sides, and not the Ritualists only, have disobeyed their bishops. It need not be here considered whether the disobedience has been justified. No one doubts that disobedience may sometimes be right, though many look round in vain for anything of sufficient moment to call for it at the present time; but it ought never to be light-hearted, never anything but severely painful. Recent disobedience has often been veiled in graceful and respectful language; but that there has been much real anguish of mind among the disobedient I do not believe.

It is the contentiousness and partisanship of the two factions, and the consequent danger of disruption, that gives importance to what is called the Crisis in the Church. The questions of the lawfulness of this or that ceremony which are so prominent in the dispute are not important. The Church of England will remain both Catholic and Protestant whether incense is burnt during her services or not. The disputants are sometimes inclined to admit this, but affirm that questions of doctrine are involved in ceremonial; yet, if so, it would surely be much more rational to dispute the underlying doctrine, and not the ceremony. Singularly, the Archbishops, in condemning the liturgical use of incense, have expressly refrained from condemning any doctrine which incense is supposed to symbolise. One might have supposed that this would have tended to quiet or, at least, to change the conflict. The Ritualists, secured as to doctrine, might naturally have been ready to waive the question of ceremony. The Church Association, on the other hand, might be expected to turn their indignation wholly on the Archbishops, or else give up the contest in despair.

For what purpose, on their own showing, is there in purging the Church of popish ceremonies, if popish doctrine is still permitted by the Archbishops? Nevertheless, the contest continues, party still fights against party, trivialities are magnified into principles, folly is added to contention, and the pettiness of the dispute would make it ludicrous if it were not shameful. None can tell when the strife will end: none can reckon the mischief it may do. Nothing seems likely to bring peace to the Church unless the contending parties and their organisations are dissolved. That dissolution should be the hope and aim of all who wish well to the Church. Schools of thought cannot be yet harmonised; but the fighting parties could and should cease to exist. It will be a glad day for the Church of England when her parties are no more.

INDEX

A

Abbot, Archbishop, 216.
 Absolution, 500, 509 ; in Eastern Church, 250.
 Africa, Church in South, 363, 371.
 Agra, Siege of, 370.
 Aidan, St., 115.
 Alexander, Dr., Bishop of Jerusalem, 223.
 Allegory and Holy Scripture, 316.
 America, Church in, 355, 360, 368 ; and the East, 225 ; missions of, 389.
 Andrew, St., Brotherhood of, 381.
 Andrewes, Bishop, 8 *note*, 15, 192, 201, 218, 408 *seq.*, 397.
 Angels and devils, belief in, 495.
 Anglican Orders, 229.
 Anglicanism, Prayer Book and, 4 ; dissent and, 5, 23 ; its meaning, 7, 11 ; Catholic, 5, 197 ; aspects of, 11 ; liberality of, 16 ; and the creeds, 206 ; ideal of, 208 ; genius of, 278 ; and education, 281, 298 ; seriousness of, 396.
 Anglican theology, reserve of, 169 ; and first principles, 172 ; and fidelity to the evidence, 174 ; compromise in, 175.
 Appeals, Statute for restraint of, 61.
 Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 64.
 Aquinas, St. Thomas, 319, 405.

Arnold, Dr., 50.
 Articles, The Thirty-nine, 171, 206, 464, 502.
 Assyrian Christians, Archbishop's Mission to the, 228.
 Atheists admitted to Parliament, 71.
 Atterbury, Bishop, 150.
 Augsburg, Confession of, 10.
 Augustine, St., 181, 316, 317, 336, 412, 415.
 Austin, Bishop of Guiana, 365.
 Australia, Church in, 362, 364.
 Authority, and revelation, 261 ; of the Church, 511.
Avis Spirituels, 208.

B

Bacon, Lord, 77, 408.
 Baptismal regeneration, 500, 509.
 Barlow, Montague, 63.
 Barry, Bishop, 167.
 Basire, Archdeacon, 217.
 Basutoland, Church in, 372.
 Bede, 115, 116, 143.
 Benefices Act of 1898, 132.
 Benson, Archbishop, 26, 151.
 Berkeley, Bishop, 358.
 Bible, The, and the Church, 312, 317, 322 ; in the Middle Ages, 319 ; and the Reformation, 321 ; and criticism, 321 ; miracles of, 327 ; use in public worship, 345 ; (*vide* Scripture, Holy).

Bishops, Appointment of, 67; and the Royal Supremacy, 68; colonial and missionary, 365; of the Anglican Communion, 366.
 Blomfield, Bishop, 222, 365.
 Board of Education, 297.
 Boissier, M., 177.
 Boniface VIII., 38.
 Bonn Conferences, 225, 233.
 Booth, Charles, 123.
 Boy Bishop, The, 395.
 Bramhall, 8, 44, 437, 443.
 Bray, Dr., 201, 358.
 Brewer, J. S., 3.
 British and Foreign Society, 289, 293.
 Broad Churchmen, 489 *seq.*
 Broughton, Bishop, 363.
 Burgon, Dean, 341.
 Burke, on the Establishment, 51.
 Butler, Bishop, 168, 169, 176, 178, 332, 445, 484.

C

Calvin, 166, 405.
 Canons (68, 59, 61), 121; (69), 84, 122; of 1532, 148; of 1604, 148, 451.
 Carey, 361.
 Casaubon, Isaac, 14, 15, 215, 408.
Case for Disestablishment, The, 102.
 Catechism, Church, 295.
 Catholic, the word, 6.
 Cedd, 116.
 Celtic Church, 351.
 Ceremonial, uniformity of, 467.
 Chad, St., 115.
 Chalcedon, Council of, 233.
 Chalmers, Dr., 52 *seq.*
 Chillingworth, 407.
 China Inland Mission, 268.
 Christianity, historical element of, 331.
 Church Association, The, 513.

Church of England, and the middle classes, 3; Catholic, 6, 8, 198 *seq.*, 449; *via media* of, 14, 210, 401; dissent and, 25, 437; and the future, 25; missions of, 26, 349 *seq.*; and reunion, 27; and Holy Scripture, 29, 230; and Christian Socialism, 30; and the State, 31, 43; and the primitive Church, 40, 199, 246; discipline in, 73; ministry of, 189; ritual of, 203; and the creeds, 206, 464; learning and, 207, 282; and the Eastern Church, 214 *seq.*, 225, 230, 245; and the sacraments, 234; and œcumenical councils, 236; and education, 278 *seq.*; and preaching, 418, 423; and Roman claims, 433, 443, 449; and uniformity, 464; parties in the, 488 *seq.*, 512.

Church and State, 36, 160, 464; in the Roman Empire, 37; in the middle ages, 38; Tudor theories, 40; Hooker on, 40; Puritans and, 41; Laudian theory, 43; the Restoration, 43; Thorndike on, 44; Warburton on, 46; respective jurisdictions of, 76 (*vide* Establishment, The).

Church, Dean, 62, 75, 166, 192, 273, 401, 408.

Church Discipline Act, 63.

Church rates, Abolition of, 71.

Church Reform League, 139.

Clements, Sub-dean, of Lincoln, 153.

Clergy of the Church of England, 18 *seq.*; marriage of, 21; sub-mission of, 62, 146; income of, parochial, 106; and canonical obedience, 136; and Parliament, 145; vote supplies to the king, 149; supply of, 383.

Clerical power, Growth of, 37

Clovesho, Council of, 117.
 C.M.S., 220, 269.
 Cockburn, Dr. John, 451.
 Coleman, Leighton, 353, 354, 357.
 Colenso, Bishop, 176.
 Coleridge, Lord, C.J., 159.
 Coleridge, S. T., 6, 7, 13, 22, 55, 272, 481.
 Colonial Bishoprics Fund, 365.
 Communion, Holy, 196; of the sick, 185 (*vide* Eucharist, The).
 Confession, Auricular, 207, 424, 504, 509.
 Controversy, 440; with Rome, 433, 442.
 Convocation, permanently prorogued, 51, 149; and the Royal Supremacy, 58; reign of Edward I., 144; and Parliament, 145, 148, 150, 158; Henry VIII., 146; the Stewarts, 148; vote supplies to the king, 149; revival of, 151; house of laymen, 151; prorogation of, 152; joint action of the two Provinces, 152; representation in, 153, 156; power of Archbishop in, 156; and the State, 158; powers of, 159.
 Copts, 221.
 Council of Trent, 13; Nicæa, 17; Clovesho, 117; Whitby, 143; Hertford, 143; Hatfield, 144; Toledo, 233; Chalcedon, 233; second of Nicæa, 236; Frankfurt, 236; Florence, 237; Vatican, 434.
 Courts, Ecclesiastical, 62, 63, 64, 75, 517.
 Cowper-Temple clause, 295, 304.
 Cranmer, Archbishop, 40, 190, 215, 398.
 Crashaw, 426.
 Creeds, The, 181, 206, 460.
 Creighton, Bishop, 207, 456, 464.

Criticism, and Holy Scripture, 321, 324; and the Church, 322, 337; textual, 324; and traditional authorship, 324; and miracles, 327, 335; "Higher," 327; and traditional views, 337; results of, 344 (*vide* Bible, The).

D

Damascus, John of, 227.
 Darmesteter, M., 28.
 Delegates, Court of, 62.
 Devils and angels, belief in, 495.
 Disendowment and disestablishment, 79; what it means, 82; and voluntary contributions, 92; in agricultural counties, 106; pecuniary effect of, 109.
Disestablishment, The case for, 102.
 Discipline, Decline of, 73.
 Dissent and Anglicanism, 5, 23.
 Döllinger, Dr., 1, 225.
 Donne, John, 412, 413, 414.

E

Eastern Churches, use of vernacular in, 183; separated communities and, 211; Greek and Russian Churches, 212; theological position of, 213; and the Church of England, 214, 225, 229, 245; liturgies of, 218, 235; and the Nonjurors, 219; and the American Church, 225; and the Bonn Conferences, 225; and Rome, 229, 244; and tradition and Scripture, 231, 243; and the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed, 232; and the Sacraments, 234; and the Councils, 236; and icons, 237; and invocation of Saints, 240; and prayers for the dead, 241; and the primitive Church, 246; and the priesthood, 249; rigidity of, 250.

Ecclesiastical courts, 60, 75.
 Education and the Church, 274, 288; Act of 1870, 71, 290; secular, 278; before the Reformation, 283; and the State, 288, 299; secondary, 296, 300, 306.
 Elizabeth, Injunctions of, 21, 456.
 Ely, Bishop of, and Convocation, 159.
 Emerson, Prof., 13.
 English Church Union, 519.
 Erasmus, 12, 215.
 Erastianism, 72.
Essays and Reviews, 63.
 Establishment, The, and Anglicanism, 17; the problems of, 35; Hooker on, 40; Warburton on, 42, 46; Thorndike on, 44, 45; Chalmers, Dr., on, 52; Coleridge, S. T., on, 55; Gladstone, W. E., on, 57; and the Royal Supremacy, 58, 68; and the ecclesiastical courts, 60; appointment of higher ecclesiastics, 67; Church history and, 71; and Parliament, 72; anomalies of, 76 (*vide* Church and State).
 Eucharist, The, 170, 171, 195, 498, 508 (*vide* Communion, Holy).
Evangelical Free Church Catechism, 256.
 Evangelicalism, 501 *seq.*
 Exchanges of benefices, 130.

F

Fairbairn, Dr., 259 *seq.*
 Fasting, 424.
 Ferrar, Nicholas, 428 *seq.*
Filioque, 227, 232.
 Freeman, Prof., 84, 87 *seq.*
 French, T. V., Bishop of Lahore, 370.

G

Gardiner, Dr., 12, 23.
 Gasquet, Dom, 12, 283, 284, 321.

Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana*, 150.
 Gladstone, W. E., 57, 64, 83, 97, 101, 108, 451, 453.
 Gobat, Bishop, 221, 223.
 Gore, C., 29, 275, 439.
 Gorham, Rev. G. C., case of, 63.
 Gray, Bishop, 363.
 Gregory, Dean, 154.
 Grotius, 16.

H

Halifax, Lord, 519.
 Hall's *Reliquiae Liturgicae*, 469 (note).
 Harnack, 254, 344.
 Hatfield, Council of, 144.
 Henry VIII. and Royal Supremacy, 59.
 Herbert, George, 194, 202, 412, 420 *seq.*, 430.
 Hertford, Council of, 143.
 High Churchmen, 505 *seq.*
 Hildner, Rev. F. A., 221.
 Hills, Bishop, 125.
 Hobhouse, Bishop, 118.
 Hook, Dr., 124, 208.
 Hooker, Richard, 40-2, 82-4, 119, 168, 170, 173, 178, 400, 407, 438, 468.
 Hort, Dr., 314, 471.
 Hospital Sunday Fund, 96.
 Howick, Lord, 453.
 Howley, Archbishop, 223.
 Hume, 263.
 Hunt, 115.

I

Illingworth, J. R., 454.
 Index, Papal, The, 12.
 India, Church in, 361, 369, 370.
 Indians, Red, 375, 376.
 Injunctions of 1559, 21.
 Ireland, Church in, 367.
 Irish Church Act, 1869, 71, 81, 97, 101.

Islington College, 269.
Israel, in New Testament, 314.

J

Jane, William, 450.
Jerusalem, Anglican bishopric of, 222.
Jews admitted to Parliament, 70.
John of Beverley, 116.
John of Damascus, 227.
Judicature Act of 1873, 64.

K

Kaffraria, St. John's, 371.
Keble, John, 178, 202.
Keswick Convention, 269.
Khomiakoff, 241, 243, 249.
Kidd, Benjamin, 366.
King, Bishop of London, 355.
King, John Glen, 220, 235.

L

Laity, The, and the parochial system, 121, 139; priesthood of, 182, 186.
Lambeth Articles, 16, 409, 411.
Lambeth Conferences, 202, 365; and the Eastern Churches, 225, 236.
Latitudinarians, 491.
Laud, Archbishop, 16, 218, 354, 407, 468.
Laymen, House of, 151, 153, 162.
Lea, J. W., 160.
Leach, 283.
Lectionary, Reform of, 190.
Lefèvre, R. P., 193, 194.
Lenton, of Gray's Inn, 429.
Leo XIII., 29.
Leti, Pomponio, 19, 20.
Letter to a Convocation Man, 149.
Letters patent, 365.
Lieder, 221.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 25, 176, 178, 190.

Lights in public worship, 417.
Litany, The, 398.
Liturgy, Rearrangement of, 196; conformity to, 482.
London Parochial Charities Act, 101.
Louis of Bavaria, 39.
Low Churchmen, 498.
Lucar, Cyril, 216.

M

Macaulay, 24.
Maccoll, Canon, 460.
Macgregor, Sir William, 377.
Maclaren, Rev. A. A., 373.
Magee, Archbishop of York, 277.
Maitland, Prof., 60.
Manning, Cardinal, 432, 434, 436, 447, 449.
Maoris, The, 376.
Martineau, Dr., 10, 18, 60.
Martyn, Henry, 362.
Maskell, W., 474.
Maurice, F. D., 464, 472, 492.
Mendham, 238.
Middle Classes and the Church, 3.
Milton, 428.
Ministry of the Church of England, 189.
Miracles and Criticism, 327, 335.
Missionary Associations of Clergy, 386.
Missions, Foreign, and the Church of England, 25; and the Prayer Book, 200; and the Reformation, 354; in America, 355, 390; in India, 361; in Australia and South Africa, 362; and the State, 366, 372; educational work of, 377; supply of clergy for, 383; and divisions in the Church, 26, 388; contributions to, 389; and party strife, 391.
Möhler, 167.

Molony, Rev. H. W. E., 384.
 Morton, Bishop of Durham, 15,
 414.
 Murray, Dr. Alexander, 357.

N

National Society, The, 289.
 Neale, J. M., 213, 217, 225.
 Nestorians, 211.
 Newfoundland, Church in, 353;
 Red Indians of, 375.
 New Guinea, Church in, 373, 377,
 388, 390.
 Newman, Cardinal, 408, 429.
 New South Wales, 363.
 New Testament, The, Canon of,
 310; miracles of, 333; and
 criticism, 344.
 Nicæa, Council of, 17; second
 council of, 236.
 Nonjurors, 45, 219, 359.

O

Old Testament, The, Canon of,
 311; and the Christian Church,
 312; history in, 333; miracles
 of, 335.
 Optatus, St., 445.
 Origen, 316, 317, 318, 336.
 Original contract, 45.
 Oswiu, 143.
 Oxford, and education of Greeks,
 218.

P

Paley, 50, 52.
 Palmer, William, 213, 225.
 Palmerston, Lord, 69.
 Parker, Archbishop, 450, 456,
 462.
 Parliament, and Convocation, 145,
 148, 150; admission to, 70.
 Parochial system, The, 74; and
 formation of, 114; mediæval
 parishes and, 118; and the

national Church, 119; and the
 clergy, 120; and the laity, 121,
 139; defects of, 124; and con-
 gregationalism, 130; and evan-
 gelistic work, 132; and clerical
 despotism, 132.

Parties in the Church, 488, 512.

Patronage, Private, 75, 116.

Pattison, Mark, 2, 4, 13, 14.

Paul's, St., School, 396.

Perfectionism, 269.

Philip of Spain, 445.

Phillimore, Sir Walter, 163.

Phillpotts, Bishop, 450, 452.

Philo, 316, 318.

Pietism, 266, 270.

Pius V., 444.

Plymouth Brethren, The, 266,
 267.

Pluralities Act of 1838, 126.

Polytechnics, The London, 101.

Popes of Avignon, 39.

Prayer-book, The, 5; influence
 of, 178, 181; prefaces of, 182,
 474; and the priesthood of the
 laity, 182, 186, 188, 189; and
 the vernacular, 183; and con-
 gregational worship, 183, 187;
 and the clergy, 185; and private
 devotion, 191; non-scriptural
 compositions in, 191; revision
 of 1552, 196; defects of, 200;
 and foreign missions, 200; and
 penitence, 182, 203, 395; and
 discipline, 204, 472; and uni-
 formity, 476.

Prayers, The "State," 182; ex-
 tempore, 481.

Præmunire, Statute of, the Pro-
 vision and, 68.

Preaching, The Church of Eng-
 land and, 418, 423.

Predestination, 171.

Priesthood, of the laity, 182, 186,
 189; Idea of, 249, 503, 509.

Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, 63, 136; bishops and, 64.
 Protestant, The term, Anglican divines and, 8, 9; meaning of, 9, 10, 439.
 Public Worship Regulation Act, The, 151.
 Purcell, E. S., 437.
 Purgatory, 194.

Q

Quakers admitted to Parliament, 70.

R

Radical Programme, The, 102.
 Reformation, The English, political aspect of, 12; and "sound learning," 13, 283; appeal to the primitive Church, 40; and the Renaissance, 285; and the Bible, 321; and the expansion of England, 353.
 Reunion of Christendom, 27.
 Revised Version, The, 29.
 Ritual, Anglican, 203, 422.
 Rolle, Richard, of Hampole, 320.
 Roman Catholics admitted to Parliament, 70; and military commissions, 452.
 Rome, Church of, 198; and the Eastern Churches, 216, 225; influence on western doctrine, 248; claims of, 432; and unity, 436; and the Church of England, 443, 448, 451; text books in, 447; and the papacy, 407; in England, 448.
 Rosmini, A., 447.
 Russian Church, The, 213, 220; and transubstantiation, 235; and icons, 240; invocation of saints, 240; national, 248 (*vide* Eastern Churches).

S

Sacraments, The Seven, 226, 234.
 Saints, invocation of, 192, 240.

Salmon, Dr., 440.
 Sanders, 60.
 Sarum, use of, 476.
 Savoy Conference, The, 479 *seq.*
 Saxon Church, The, 351.
 Schools, and Training Colleges, sums expended on, 96; founded by Churchmen, 289; boarding, 307.
 Schools of Thought in the Church of England, 488 *seq.*, 512.
 Scripture, Holy, and public services, 190; and tradition, 231; and Dissent, 267; authority of, 310, 312, 319; and allegory, 316; and criticism, 321, 324 (*vide* Bible).
 Seabury, Bishop, 360.
 Selborne, Lord, 64, 69, 85, 91, 106, 107, 131.
 Selden, 160, 395.
 Shorthouse, Mr., 424, 430.
 Smith, Prof. W. Robertson, 470.
 Socialism, Christian, 30.
 S.P.C.K., 358.
 S.P.G., 357, 358, 452.
 Spires, Diet of, 10.
 Stanley, Dean, 15, 359.
 State, The, and education, 289; and missions, 359, 366 (*vide* Church and State).
 "State" Prayers, 182.
 Stepney, Parish of, 125, 355.
 Stillingfleet, 218.
 Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 58, 66, 91, 114, 117, 156.
 Submission of the Clergy, 146.
 Supremacy, Royal, The, and the Establishment, 58; Acts of 1534 and 1559, 59; Bramhall and, 60.

T

Tait, Archbishop, 19, 151.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 8, 9, 173.
 Temple, Archbishop, 467.

Test Law, The, 49, 55, 70.
 Text books, Roman theological, 447.
 Theodore, Archbishop, 115, 143, 236.
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 74.
 Thorndike, 8, 44.
 Tithe, 89, 91.
 Tithes Bill, Clerical, 93.
 Toledo, Council of, 233.
 Tradition and Holy Scripture, 231.
 Transubstantiation, 234.
 Travers, 403, 405.
 Trent, Council of, 13.
 Tucker, Preb., 371.

U

Udenominationalism, 265, 291, 307.
 Uniformity, 454; Elizabeth and, 456; function of, 458; in the Church of England, 463; of dogmatic expression, 464; in public worship, 466, 470; Act of 1662, 483; danger of, 484.
 Unity of Christendom, Association for Promoting the, 436.
 Uses, 474.

V

Venn, Mr., 222.
Via del Paradiso, 194.
Via media of the Church of England, 14, 210, 401.
 Virginia, The Church in, 353, 356, 357.
 Voluntary contributions of the Church of England, 94.

W

Wake, Archbishop, 150, 219.
 Wales, Disestablishment of, 97, 99, 101.
 Walton, Izaak, 15, 402, 408, 412, 430.
 Warburton, William, 42, 46, 55, 70, 73.
 Warham, Archbishop, 58.
 Watson, Bishop, of Llandaff, 134.
 Webbe, Bishop, 387.
 Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 296.
 Wesley, John, 358, 360.
 Wesleyan Methodists, 129, 258.
 Westcott, Bishop, 455.
 Westminster Assembly, 468.
 Whitby, Council of, 143.
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 16, 403, 502.
 Wilberforce, Bishop, 64, 151.
 Wilfrid, St., 116.
 William III., 158.
 Williams, George, 214, 220, 223, 225.
 Winchester, Bishop of, 380.
 Worship, Anglican, and the Prayer book, 180; congregational, 183; scriptural, 190; purpose of, 195; and the Eucharist, 195; sobriety of, 202; ideal of, 208; uniformity in, 470, 473.
 Wotton, Sir Henry, 403, 412, 413.

Y

York, Provincial synod of, 144.

Z

Zululand, Church in, 372.



Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01245 1185

